



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

~~George Adams~~
Jesse

George Adams

3011 e. 7

HULSEAN PRIZE ESSAYS

FOR THE YEAR 1855.

THE INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY ON THE
LANGUAGE OF MODERN EUROPE.

The Essays which obtained the Bulsean Prize

FOR THE YEAR 1855.

BY

WILLIAM JENNINGS REES, B.A.

SCHOLAR AND MADYN'S STUDENT OF ST JOHN'S COLLEGE,
AND CROSE UNIVERSITY SCHOLAR;

AND THE

REV. WILLIAM AYERST, B.A.

LATE SCHOLAR OF CAIUS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,
ASSOCIATE, AND LATE SCHOLAR OF KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

CAMBRIDGE:
DEIGHTON, BELL AND Co.
LONDON: BELL AND DALDY.
1856.

3011. e 7



TO THE
REV. WILLIAM WHEWELL, D.D.
MASTER OF TRINITY COLLEGE, AND VICE-CHANCELLOR;

THE
REV. RALPH TATHAM, D.D.
MASTER OF ST JOHN'S COLLEGE;

AND THE
REV. WILLIAM HEPWORTH THOMPSON, M.A.
REGIUS PROFESSOR OF GREEK;

THE HULSEAN TRUSTEES FOR THE YEARS 1855—6;

These Essays
ARE BY PERMISSION MOST RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED
BY
THE AUTHORS.

CLAUSES *directed by the FOUNDER to be always prefixed*
to the HULSEAN DISSERTATION.

CLAUSES from the WILL of the Rev. JOHN HULSE, late of Elworth, in the County of Chester, clerk, deceased : dated the twenty-first day of July, in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and seventy-seven ; expressed in the words of the Testator, as he, in order to prevent mistakes, thought proper to draw and write the same himself, and directed that such clauses should every year be printed, to the intent that the several persons, whom it might concern and be of service to, might know that there were such special donations or endowments left for the encouragement of Piety and Learning, in an age so unfortunately addicted to Infidelity and Luxury, and that others might be invited to the like charitable, and, as he humbly hoped, seasonable and useful Benefactions.

He directs that certain rents and profits (now amounting to about a hundred pounds yearly) be paid to such learned and ingenious person, in the University of Cambridge, under the degree of Master of Arts, as shall compose, for that year, the best Dissertation, in the English language, on the Evidences in general, or on the Prophecies or Miracles in particular, or any other particular Argument, whether the same be direct or collateral proofs of the Christian Religion, in order to evince its truth and

excellence; the subject of which Dissertation shall be given out by the Vice-Chancellor, and the Masters of Trinity and Saint John's, his Trustees, or by some of them, on New Year's Day annually; and that such Dissertation as shall be by them, or any two of them, on Christmas Day annually, the best approved, be also printed, and the expense defrayed out of the Author's income under his Will, and the remainder given to him on Saint John the Evangelist's Day following; and he who shall be so rewarded, shall not be admitted at any future time as a Candidate again in the same way, to the intent that others may be invited and encouraged to write on so sacred and sublime a subject.

He also desires, that immediately following the last of the clauses relating to the prize Dissertation, this invocation may be added: "May the Divine Blessing for ever go along with all my benefactions; and may the Greatest and the Best of Beings, by his all-wise Providence and gracious influence, make the same effectual to His own glory, and the good of my fellow-creatures!"

Subject proposed by the TRUSTEES for the Year 1855:

*"The Influence of Christianity on the Language
of Modern Europe."*

* * In accordance with the above Will, the Authors of these Essays have published them, in the same form as they were sent in to the Trustees, with the exception of some few alterations in the notes. The first Essay in order is by Mr Rees, the second by Mr Ayerst.

Cambridge, February, 1856.

ESSAY I.

INTRODUCTION.

ON LANGUAGE GENERALLY.

THIS question is one that at first sight would appear to be of no ordinary magnitude, and to necessitate no ordinary amount of knowledge on the part of any that should handle it; involving as it might well seem to do, an acquaintance, not only with the general Philosophy of Language and with the somewhat obscure social history of the middle ages, but also with the principal, if not all, the languages of Modern Europe. But a little consideration will, I think, suffice to shew us, that this supposition though apparently reasonable, is erroneous; and that strictly interpreted, the phrase "Language (not 'Languages') of Modern Europe" would imply, that the question to be considered is not so much the influence of Christianity on the verbal structure of each or every language, though this will also find some place in our remarks, as its influence on those underlying ideas which are common to all or most of those languages,—the spirit as it were one and the same always, though in each country clothed upon with a different body.

But while our subject is thus limited (if we may so term what is rather a generalisation and therefore an extension) on the one hand to the consideration of language generally, rather than of six or eight different

languages; on the other hand we must notice a legitimate extension of the idea involved in the word Christianity. A deservedly popular and acute writer¹ of the present day, speaking of Christianity as a "new moral and spiritual force beginning to work and to stir society to its central depths," observes, that its influence on language, though only slightly touched on by himself, is "a subject well worthy of, and affording ample materials for, a whole volume." But worthy and wide as this view may be, there are two others not altogether unworthy of our consideration. Into *four*² of the principal *languages* of Europe Latin enters, if not as the primary root, at least as an important supplementary addition; and it may not be altogether unprofitable to discuss how far Christianity, considered as an established power of the state, at the time these languages were still in their plastic youth, contributed to introduce and maintain the Latin element in the new tongues, and how far it modified the element it thus introduced. But Christianity was not only a new power and an established estate of the realm, but further brought forward with itself a book, or rather *the* Book; and this fact will be found to be of no inconsiderable influence both as regards language and ideas. Before entering on the examination of our subject as thus finally particularised (*viz.* the influence of Christianity, as a moral power, a state establishment, and a "*book revelation*," on language), we would make this remark, that in most instances general influences and their results, and not particular effects, will be sought after and followed out, while in many cases mere hints will be all that can be given.

¹ Trench, *On the English Language. On the Study of Words*, pp. 9, 103.

² *i. e.* French, Italian, English and Spanish: cf. p. 21.

Now as to our *first point*, the influence of Christianity as a new moral and spiritual power, it is plain that it will merely differ, in importance and not in nature, from that called into action by the upspringing of other principles in the moral and social world, as for example, by the introduction of Greek Philosophy into Rome, by the rise of the Scholastic Philosophy of the middle ages, and by the fermenting leaven of the French Revolution. This then will be no unfit place to introduce a few remarks on language generally, which may serve to shew its capability of being impoverished or enriched, of being moulded into this form or that, according to the influences which have been at work on it and on its employers; and how, according to the culture and attention that has been bestowed on or withheld from it, its individual words assume or lose their pregnancy and distinctness of meaning. And *first* we seem to be, to a great extent, indebted to Christianity for our present favourable position with regard to philological studies generally, for lexicography in its highest sense is a product of modern civilisation: it was unknown to, or at best but obscurely anticipated by, the heathen world. Not only that materials were wanting for Comparative Philology, they wanted also the "Universal Standpunkt," the comprehensive survey of the relation between "all peoples, nations, and languages," which Christianity has brought in. Even the most far-sighted among the ancients were blind to the fine and secret chain of intellectual connexions which constitute the transition from barbarous to civilised nations; for after the widest expansion of the Roman Empire, sharp lines of distinction separated the Græco-Roman from the barbarian tribes; nor did any till long after conceive of language as a living and necessary organism of the human mind; a religion was wanted which knew neither "barbarian,

Scythian, bond nor free," to destroy the opinion that any people or language were to be utterly despised. For we may surely assume, that language was not at first a mere *accident* of our nature, acquired like most arts and sciences by invention, and elaborated by careful research, but rather a capability bestowed on man at his creation, so that its idea was *innate* in, though its actuality was not *connate* with, man; *i.e.* that no perfect language was formed at once, but that Adam and his successors were gifted with the power of naming things, relations, and affections, according as circumstances requiring their use arose; and Genesis ii. 19, 20, will serve as an example of this. But should we require any further proof or illustration of the theory beyond its own inherent reasonableness, one may be found in a fact, which, while it establishes our hypothesis, militates strongly against Montaigne's favourite notion of looking for the origin of civilisation in the haunts of savages. For it will be found, I believe, on examination, in almost every case, that the language of the savage instead of shewing signs of improvement rather retrogrades; so that while by the retention of some words it gives proof of a higher civilisation in earlier stages of the nation's history, it also manifests, by the misuse or total disappearance of others, the gradual degradation it is suffering at the hands (or rather at the tongues) of its possessors; for the strictest relation must always subsist between a nation and its language; nor will the name long remain when the reality has vanished and the idea become obsolete. Several curious proofs of this are furnished by the observations of our missionaries, one or two of which will suffice for our present purpose. Moffat¹, in his *Missionary Labours and Scenes in South Africa*, states, that among the Bechuanas, a Caffre tribe, the idea of a

¹ Moffat, as quoted by Trench, *On Words*, pp. 18, 19.

Supreme Being has so entirely vanished, that the word *Morimo*, which formerly expressed that idea among them, is now scarcely ever used, except in charms and incantations. Again, Dobrizhoffer the Jesuit, in his history of the *Abipones*¹, a Brazilian tribe, tells us they have no word to express thanks, and, as we might expect, no feeling of gratitude. So again to look on the brighter side of the picture, among a people advancing in religious and social culture, the language is being continually enriched, deepened, and subtilised, to give expression to and retain the ideas continually flashing from the master minds of the age, thus fixing them and making them public property for ever.

¹ *Abipones*. This curious tribe is moreover wanting in distinguishing words for the following ideas, "Man, body, God, place, time, virgin, ever, never, everywhere;" while it is the custom among them to change by proclamation any word which closely resembles the appellation of a late deceased chief or prince.

CHAPTER I.

INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY AS A NEW MORAL POWER.

WE are now, from our brief consideration of the origin and nature of language, and its inseparable connexion with ideas, prepared to expect that, at certain stages of a nation's history, great and important changes would take place in its language; and such we shall find to have been pre-eminently the case at the commencement of the Christian era. Great and novel truths had to be proclaimed, and to clothe themselves in appropriate language; hence we shall find on investigation, 1st, that many new words then arose¹; 2ndly, that many old ones were invested with a deeper and more spiritual meaning; and 3rdly, that a more special distinction then began to be made between kindred and before almost synonymous words: and these three assertions we will proceed to support and illustrate with such examples as most readily offer themselves.

And first, as to the introduction of new words. Passing over the technicalities of the new motive power,—such as the name of “Christian,” the mystery of the “Trinity,” the terms “Canonical,” “Gospel,” &c., let us pause one moment and consider the word “idolatry,” *εἰδωλολατρεία*². It is at once evident that only among

¹ Trench has some capital remarks bearing on this point in his *Sacred Latin Poetry*. Introd. pp. 5, 6.

² *Idolatry*. This word at first struck me as more applicable to the third part of my argument, as an illustration of the influence of the Bible in introducing Hebrew ideas, but, on a careful search of the Hebrew Bible, I could not find that its equivalent ever occurred there; the word translated “idolatry” in 1 Sam. xv. 23, being in the original *עֲבֹדָת עֲצָבוֹת* *Idols*. For the remarks, cf. Trench, p. 105.

a people professing the worship of one true and only God could such a word arise; for what signification could it have conveyed to an old Greek? What necessity would ever have led him to coin a word, which to others has been necessary to express a deep and deadly sin, thoroughly opposed to the earnest convictions of their consciences? "Beloved," says the Apostle Paul, "flee from idolatry." Again, in what is the Gospel spirit more distinguished from the spirit of the world than in its *longsuffering*? To quote texts praising and inculcating this virtue, would be both unnecessary and tedious, so frequently do they occur. God's longsuffering was a theme for the Hebrew psalmist's harp, and prophet's pen; hence from their expressive diction אַרְךָ רֵיחַ "long of spirit," did the Christian writers form the Greek words μακρόθυμος, μακροθυμία, which have now passed into common use in our *longsuffering*¹, the German *langmuth*, &c. The doctrine of the "resurrection" is the key-stone of our faith; for "if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." (1 Cor. xv. 13, 14.) And yet this grand doctrine appears to have been not only unintelligible, but even absurd to the acute and polished Athenians, for Paul seemed to them "to be a setter forth of strange gods, because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection;" and "when they heard of the *resurrection of the dead*, some mocked." (Acts xvii. 18, 32.) Nor was this wonderful; for if we turn to the use of the word ἀνάστασις² in their own literature, we find it *generally* applied to the raising up of suppliants, or the devastation of an enemy's land; and when in its new sense

¹ The Douay translators used the word "longanimity."

² It occurs once with reference to the dead in Æsch. *Eum.* 648; cf. Porson on Eur. *Phœn.* 581.

it had to be represented by a Latin equivalent, we find an entirely new word, "resurrectio;" whence our own and the French "resurrection," and (in identity of meaning) the German *auferstehung*. Along with the *μακροθυμία* of the new dispensation, we may class its lowliness of mind, "humility," a virtue fully as much as the former opposed to the Pagan spirit. To express it, therefore, a new word is formed in the Greek, "ταπεινοφροσύνη," and in Latin an *old one*¹ is redeemed from its former degraded meaning, and exalted to a higher and more spiritual idea; hence come our "humility," the French "humilité," and the German "sanftmuth;" which latter more closely follows the Greek original. In this case there is a Latin word already formed, needing only to be advanced from its vile estate, while the Greek correlative is altogether new. Our next and final example will be one which, on the contrary, found a Greek equivalent, but had to be re-struck in the Latin mint: I mean the word "salvator," answering to the Greek *σωτήρ*, and Hebrew *יִשְׁעָר*. The want of such a Latin word was recognised by Cicero, but not supplied till St Augustine².

It would, perhaps, be not superfluous to correct here a misapprehension, which might arise from the fact, that all the former examples are taken either from Latin or Greek, while our subject is the Influence of Christianity on Modern Language: but it must be borne in mind, that through these languages alone, at the period of which we are speaking, could that influence be exerted, since it had not yet been brought into contact with the still plastic languages of the barbarians; and, moreover, all the above words, *εἰδωλολατρεία*, *μακρο-*

¹ i. e. *humilitas*.

² So Trench *On Words*, p. 115; but cf. Bp Pearson's note to p. 111 of Tegg's Edit. 1848.

θυμία, ἀνάστασις, ταπεινοφροσύνη, *humilitas, resurrectio*, and *salvator*, have, either by direct derivation or in idea, passed into, and thus been the means of enriching, every language of Christendom.

Two¹ of the above naturally lead us to the second point of our first division, viz. "that many old words were by the rise of Christianity invested with higher and more spiritual meanings;" and this in their case has been sufficiently demonstrated; we will therefore proceed to other examples. But before doing so, we would remark, that this influence is one of the most important of all, and that there are few things which better testify to the genius and spirit of Christianity than the words which it has ennobled, while certainly it can scarcely have a more enduring manifestation of the same; for, while with Horace² we desire for it "*monumentum ære perennius*," we can exclaim in a much truer sense, "*vivet per ora virum*." If we consider the deep traces of degradation, the serpent's trail, as it were, impressed on all language, the large number of words expressive of the vices, follies, and miseries of mankind, as compared with their opposites³; (so that in Holy Writ, St Paul balances but nine of the latter against seventeen of the former); if we watch attentively the tendency⁴ that words of originally good meaning have to sink down and acquire a baser idea, either from their frequent assumption by mere pretenders to the virtues implied therein, or from the natural weakness and depravity of the human mind, which takes evil for good, and good for evil (and suffi-

¹ i. e. *humilitas* and ἀνάστασις.

² Horace, *Carm.* iii. 30, 1.

³ Cf. Gal v. 19—22.

⁴ For such a *tendency* of language we have the testimony of Thucydides in his remarks on the Corcyrean Sedition. Cf. Bk. iii. c. 81. His words are, "καὶ τὴν εἰωθυῖαν ἀξίωσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐς τὰ ἔργα ἀντήλλαξαν τῇ δικαιοῦσει, τόλμα γὰρ ἀλόγιστος ἀνδρία φιλέταιρος ἐνομίσθη. κ.τ.λ."

cient examples of this tendency will be found in the words, *prude, simple, silly, retract*¹); we shall be led to recognise the operation of God's sanctifying Spirit in the ennobling and raising of words, so that what were "servants to uncleanness, and to iniquity unto iniquity," are now made to yield themselves "servants to righteousness unto holiness."

And first in its very spirit, Christianity is opposed to that softening down of the guilt of an action by means of some mild appellative, so well expressed by the Greek *ὑποκορίζεσθαι*, the dread of "calling a spade a spade," as our own homely but forcible phrase runs, which perhaps is as fatal to the cause of virtue as many other more seemingly influential temptations. In our own tongue we can easily string together such light and careless expressions for even deadly sins, as, "a case of crim. con." "a gay Lothario," and others; while in foreign languages we may often meet with softened and even jesting appellations for crimes, as in French, with "*faux pas*," "*Chevalier d'Industrie*," in Italian, "*Aiutata*"=poisoned; and such old writers as Aristophanes, Lucian and Ovid, abound with them; so that we must not, from the many remaining specimens in modern times, assume that Christianity has not the tendency above claimed for it, but rather lament that the spirit of this World is strong enough seriously to impede that tendency, though it cannot altogether obviate it. But we will turn to a brighter side of the question. The course of nature is not changed; epidemic diseases from time to time still afflict whole nations; these are still recognised as of divine mission; but of old it was the wrath of Jove, now it is the mercy of Jehovah sends

¹ *Prude* was originally "prudent," "brave;" cf. "*prud'homme*." *Silly* is said to be from *selig*, the German for "blessed." *Retract*, "to handle again," and of course "to find wrong."

them: we recognise a Father's hand, and hope that the chastening may yield the peaceable fruits of righteousness, in us that are exercised thereby. And this distinction has impressed itself on the language. While Athens mourned her ruin (λῦμα) and her defilement (λυμαίνομαι), in the name (λοιμός) she attached to the desolating scourge which attacked her in the Peloponnesian war; while Livy commemorates the pestilence (*pestis*) which so often fell upon (? πεσεῖν) Rome, we, in the "Plague of London" see the correcting stroke (*plaga*) of an offended but gracious God. Again, what a deep Christian comfort is contained in the words θλίψις and *tribulatio*, which are almost peculiar to the Scriptural and Ecclesiastical writers. For in the midst of all *our* tribulations, we can use the confident language of St Paul, "θλιβόμενοι ἀλλ' οὐ στενοχωρούμενοι," knowing that "tribulation worketh patience;" and that if we in an honest and true heart having heard the word keep it, the thorns (*tribuli*¹) of this world, shall not choke the good seed and render it unfruitful, but shall rather hereafter form our crown of glory in the presence of our crucified Master. In this way we might proceed with the name of every Christian grace and virtue, such as Faith, Hope, Love, and Patience, unfolding their higher acceptation and idea, as compared with the old πίστις, ἔλπις, &c. But enough has been said on this point. Yet I cannot refrain from touching on the heightened sanctity of some few other words² on which Christianity has impressed its seal,

¹ *Tribuli* = caltrops. This derivation has been suggested for the word, though probably it comes from *tribulum* a thrashing sledge; connected with the Latin "tero" and Greek θλίβω; and this latter derivation is as full of ethical meaning as the former, for the world is God's threshingfloor, as we read in Matthew iii. 12, "He will thoroughly purge his floor."

² Of course it is for the ideas in, and not for the forms of, these words, that I take them thus promiscuously from different languages;

such as ἐκκλησία, παλιγγενεσία, χάρις, Martyr, Bible, Sacrament, Absolution, Vocation, Devotion, Cross, &c., some of which at once suggest their history, while others need some slight elucidation. Thus ἐκκλησία, once a popular assembly, now expresses those called out by God from the world into the assembly and church of the first-born; an idea far superior to that involved in the words Synagogue or Congregation, which might apply to *voluntary* assemblies, even of *brutes*. A *martyr* is now a "witness unto death" for the truth. "The offence of the *Cross*" hath ceased; nor can we any longer say, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." The *Sacrament* of Baptism is the enlisting oath of the young Christian soldier; the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the Christian Mystery and solemn engagement. The *Bible* is the one book. The *Divine Name*¹ is also full of instruction, even if we have to reject the comparison of the derivation of θεός and its cognate *Deus* (as given in Plat. *Cratyl.* 397) from θέειν to run, because the first gods were the Sun, Moon, and Stars, with the modern *Gott* and *God*, which are manifestly connected with *Gut* and *Good*. For "God" gives us the idea of one all-powerful and Divine Being, while *Deus* in Classical Latin can scarcely ever be translated by *Dieu* or *Le Dieu*, but is almost always equivalent to *Un Dieu*, or *Un des Dieux*. And finally, how pregnant has the word *regeneration* become, and how much depends on the correct acceptance of what in the original (παλιγγενεσία) merely expressed "transmigration of souls" (Pythagoras), "renovation of the earth at spring" (Stoics), "initiation into the mysteries"

some of them may be found more fully discussed in Trench's *Greek Testament Synonyms*.

¹ On this subject, compare an Essay by Michaelis, on the "Influence of Opinion on Language."

(Epicureans), or, as among the Jews, “manumission of slaves.”

While on this topic, we may notice some few words which have received, through the influence of Christianity, a degraded signification. Such are Heresy, from *αἵρεσις* a choice: Pagan¹ and Heathen, properly inhabitants of villages and heaths, since such maintained longest the old system of Polytheism. Again, the history of our word Demon (almost now synonymous with Devil) is curious.

The Greeks worshipped *δαίμονια* as mild and beneficent powers; hence the Alexandrine Jews, and therefore the translators of the Septuagint, identified them with angels, and since they accepted the worship due only to the Supreme, necessarily thought them to be the evil angels; in this acceptance then the word is transferred to the Greek Testament, and used extensively by the Fathers, more especially by Tertullian and Justin Martyr.

The change in our ideas wrought by Christianity is testified to by the bad sense we attach to the word “self-sufficient,” knowing what an untruth it represents, while to a Greek *αὐταρκής* was a most complimentary appellation. We have only to compare such a passage as (2 Corinth. iii. 5), “Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God;” with the way in which Aristotle (*Nic. Ethics*, A. 5—35) shews, that a man possessed of his fancied *τέλειον ἀγαθόν* will be *αὐταρκής* not only as regards himself, but with respect to his parents, his children, his friends, relations and compatriots. Somewhat similar remarks will apply to the phase of character

¹ *Pagan*. This word, in our modern sense, first appears in an edict of Valentinian...A.D. 365: cf. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, c. 21, end, note.

distinguished by the same philosopher with the title *μεγαλοπρεπεία, -ής*; and many useful examples might be drawn from an investigation of the "Characters" of his disciple Theophrastus. These few remarks will, it is hoped, have sufficiently illustrated the influence of Christianity in changing the former signification of words.

To complete the first division of our subject, we have now to consider its influence in leading to the recognition of a distinctive difference between words, which would otherwise have been held as synonymous; nor is this by any means an unimportant point. For after the first decided pause in the formation of a language, when it appears to have attained its maturity, the desynonymising of words is one of the few methods by which it may be permanently and considerably enriched: and the efforts in this direction of numerous writers in our own tongue alone, will herein bear us ample testimony¹. And as there never have been truths so important committed to writing as those enshrined in the Scriptures, so in no case is more accuracy needed than in the strict definition of the words in which these truths lie embodied, and by which they are conveyed to us; while the grave importance of the subject, and the lamentable disorders which have arisen from a neglect of these principles, will be a sufficient defence for us from the charge of word-splitting, so wittily urged, in the *Protagoras* of Plato, by Socrates, against the sophist Prodicus. Now in this instance, the influence of Christianity is by no means so directly exercised, as in some of the former, for it seems mostly to lie, as we have above stated, in the importance of the truths enunciated; a fact, which from time to time has led men seriously to consider, whether there be not some peculiar appropriateness in the words used by the

¹ Such as Coleridge, Wordsworth, Whately, Trench, &c.

Sacred Penman, so that, whether rightly or wrongly, they have often gone so far as to assert, that *any* change in the phraseology would be fatal to the doctrine therein involved.

Now the statement of the peculiar way in which this influence is exercised is almost proof sufficient, for our purpose, of its influence; and we shall find, moreover, that its want of directness renders the selection of examples and illustrations somewhat difficult, especially as it lies much more "in posse" than "in esse." However, the few following remarks may serve to establish this point, and so conclude this branch of our subject.

As we might expect, among heathen nations the feeling of anger was almost altogether personal, and was excited by reflection on wrongs done to oneself, or perhaps, to one's friends. And thus such words as *θυμός* and *ὀργή* were in vulgar parlance pretty nearly confounded, while, even among philosophers, distinctions were made between them, merely with reference to their relative intensity and duration; so that *θυμός*, they said, meant sudden *passion*, *ὀργή* settled *anger*. But a Christian can be "very jealous for the Lord God of Hosts," and thus "be angry, and sin not;" in short, be "filled with righteous *indignation*;" a word which to my ear naturally expresses a just anger at injustice and wrong, and not merely against the unjust and wrong-doer; so that it would have been well if, throughout the Scriptures, our translators had marked the distinction between the good and evil uses of the word *ὀργή*, as in Mark iii. 5, Eph. iv. 31, by always using this word for the former, and "anger" for the latter, translating *θυμός* by "wrath," and *ἀγανάκτησις* (as in Rom. iii. 8, Acts v. 17) by "irritation" or "vexation." This illustrates the *possible* influence of Christianity, as above suggested. As a proof of its actual existing influence we may quote our "Faith,

Belief, Trust, Confidence," all renderings of the same Greek word *πίστις*, and the Latin *Fides* and *Fiducia*. How varied is the meaning of, and how subtle the distinction between, these words! *Faith* is more applicable to Divine, *Belief* to human affairs; hence Bp Pearson's definition, "Belief is an assent to that which is credible as credible; Faith is an assent to something as credible on the testimony of God;" while *Trust* and *Confidence* express the frame of mind produced by these assents. The advantage accruing to a language from the possession of different words for these different ideas is of the greatest importance, especially in theological discussions. In French we find *Foi* and *Croyance*, Faith and Belief; in German, *Glaube* and *Vertrauen*, Faith and Trust.

Again, the searching spirit of Christianity has, of late years, been leading moralists to distinguish more and more between the ideas involved in the words "Education" and "Instruction," both equally renderings of the Greek *παιδεία* (cf. Plat. *Phæd.* 107, D. with *Protag.* 327, D.) In none of the definitions in Plato do we find the least intimation of a sense of discipline or correction, as connected with this word, one of those many, "into which¹ the more earnest spirit of revealed religion has put a deeper meaning than it knew of before that took possession of it." All free Greeks of good family partook of the customary *παιδεία*, but we are painfully aware that many a youth in our schools is *instructed* without being *educated*. This example will testify to the indirect influence claimed for Christianity, in desynonymising words; and thus we may now be considered to have sufficiently illustrated the first division of our subject.

¹ Trench's *Words*, in p. 21 of his *New Testament Synonyms*.

CHAPTER II.

INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY AS A STATE ESTABLISHMENT.

THE second point we have to establish, is the influence of Christianity as a constituted power of the state, at what we may call the birth of the modern languages of Europe, in modifying, introducing, and sustaining the Latin element: an inquiry which will be almost altogether historical. We shall find it of no little advantage, previous to the more technical part of our argument, to endeavour to present to our minds what the Christian Church at this time was, and what various changes it had already passed through¹. At its first establishment then it consisted of individual churches, founded by Apostles or Apostolic men, with no strictly legal or doctrinal bond, further than that they were animated by the same religious convictions, sustained by the same hopes, and harassed by the same fears. But the increasing number of churches and congregations demanded, even in Apostolic times, a more regular organisation; hence in the very earliest remains to which we have access, we distinguish the rise of a dogmatic theology, a magisterial supremacy, and a discipline more or less fixed. This organisation² was, of course, gradual, but was without doubt directed by the Apostles, and in all essential particulars completed in their times. The distinguishing feature of this second epoch of the Church consisted in the fact, that subject

¹ Cf. Guizot's *Histoire de la Civilisation Européenne*.

² Cf. Robertson's *History of the Early Church*, p. 7.

to Apostolic ordination, the choice of ministers, the adoption of disciplinary rules, if not of doctrines too, lay with the entire body of believers. But in the third epoch, which embraces the period at present under consideration, we perceive an important difference. A clergy had then been established, self-elective, possessing a special jurisdiction, and a peculiar constitution,—in fact, with respect to the faithful, a supreme ruling body. The Church had thus become a society possessed of a vigorous government, an elastic revenue, and extensive means of union and connected action, in its provincial and general synods. The existence of such a society had a wondrous effect during the decline of the Roman empire, both in the preservation of Christianity itself, and in advancing the cause of civilisation. Dark and troubled¹ as must often have been the forebodings of enlightened men in those ages, there were at least rays of light and hope from this source, to illumine the black despair which must otherwise have settled on their minds, and instances of which may be found in the sad reflections of heathen writers of the times. But beyond the fact of its own union—a most important element of strength—it possessed another and very different kind of influence, from the fact that the only real authority (to speak correctly) then existing in the Roman empire, viz. the municipal administration, had, through the apathy of the curiales, the oppression of despotism, and the gradual ruin of the cities, fallen naturally into the zealous hands of the bishops and clergy; and to prove this we need only refer to the Pandects of Justinian, and out of many similar instances, select the annexed passage for quotation; it is found in Bk. I. sec. 55, “de Defensoribus,” and runs thus: “It is ordained that the officers styled *defensores urbium*, being well instructed

¹ Cf. Smyth's *Lectures on History*, Vol. I. p. 33.

in the holy mysteries of the orthodox faith, be selected and instituted by the venerable bishops, clergy, nobles, landowners, and curiales." We may thus understand the prodigious influence the Church possessed, both from her own constitution, and from her position with regard to the civil administration, and shall not wonder at the important part she acted in forming the character and aiding the development of civilisation generally. In this she was materially assisted by the Roman law, now become her ally instead of her foe. This connexion was mutually beneficial, for as the law had contributed to establish Christianity, so did Christianity now contribute to preserve the law; and consequently the great influence on language of the Roman law, which has become the basis of most modern systems, we may in some sense attribute to Christianity, more especially as it has been manifested in a similar manner, viz. in the introduction and preservation of the Latin element. But though this be the case, and though the influence of Christianity on Roman law, both in modifying and preserving it, is a subject well deserving elucidation at the hands of those versed in legal studies, yet its connexion with our subject is too slight to render it necessary to do more than merely allude to it here, and so pass on to the consideration of the influence of Christianity directly on the Latin language.

Now the first thing that strikes us is, that at the period of which we speak, *i.e.* from the beginning of the third to the end of the fourth century, the most important of the Latin writers were Christians; for in vigour, depth of thought, correctness, and even elegance of expression, Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Lactantius, and St Augustine, were far superior to such men as Apuleius, Libanius, and Symmachus. Their influence therefore in modifying the language would necessarily be great, and

would be manifested in the introduction of Hebraisms and Græcisms, and in the peculiar meanings now first bestowed on old and well-known Latin words, as well as in the coining of new ones. In proof of this we need only quote St Augustine's own words in his tract, *De Doct. Christ.* Lib. I. c. 15: "Yet," says he, "so great is the influence of custom on our students, that those who from their youth have been nourished in and brought up on, the Holy Scriptures, are much more astonished at variations¹ of expression, and more apt to hold them as inferior Latin, than they are with regard to what they have learnt in the Bible, and do not find in the classical writers." This sets before our eyes pretty fairly the models of composition in the third and fourth centuries; and, as years rolled on, the classical authors were thrown more and more into the background, and an ecclesiastical education occupied the place of their study. Jerome's Latin version of the Bible became the standard and rule of the whole language, and thenceforth Christian modes of thought, by change or reconstruction, adapted to them the Latin garb they had assumed. Now we have seen above² that the Church was almost the only constituted authority which the Barbarians found in full vigour, on their establishment upon the ruins of the Western Roman Empire, and we have ample testimony to the zeal displayed by the clergy of that time in bringing the invaders into the pale of the Church, and of the success which attended their efforts; it would therefore at once follow, as a necessary consequence, that the Latin language must have had very great effect on the various dialects of the conquerors, proportionate of course to the previous hold that Christi-

¹ Variations, i. e. from ecclesiastical language and modes of expression.

² Above, cf. pp. 18, 19.

anity had on the countries in which they settled. For most of the devotional and other works of the Church of that day, at least in the western part of the Empire, were in Latin, and the same was the vernacular tongue of those whom the new converts took for spiritual guides. And indeed it would seem almost impossible to exaggerate the influence that the theological and religious writings of these times had upon the half-formed and plastic languages of the Barbarians. Instead of the work of transmutation and adjustment which Christianity had to perform on the Latin language, it made these, on the contrary, rise to the level of its demands, and become adequate exponents of its deepest truths, so that to it they owe mainly all that characterises them most strongly; and this we have attempted to shew above, confining ourselves rather to the philosophical discussion of the new ideas called into being. But we see now that it had a very important philological influence, as it necessarily introduced a large Latin element into the Barbarian dialects; and this influence is still traceable in its effects. Taking the principal languages of Modern Europe, the French, English, Spanish, Italian, German, and Russian, we find in the first four indubitable marks of a Latin origin, exercising its influence of course proportionably to the hold Christianity and Roman Law had on the people, and modified by foreign elements introduced by conquest, or otherwise; while on the other hand, we see indications of a similar origin almost entirely wanting in German and Russian, into which countries Christianity and Roman Law did not penetrate till some time after the permanent settling of their customs and language; a striking instance of the kindred influence alluded to in p. 19. No illustrations are needed of this part of our subject; they are obvious to any one; but

perhaps it would not be amiss to subjoin a few remarks, not on the influence of Latin on the languages of modern Europe, but on the influence of Christianity on Latin; the reality and magnitude of which we have above insisted on, and proved from the testimony of St Augustine; from whose works most of our illustrations at this point will be drawn, entitled as he is to the appellation of "the second Tully of the Roman tongue," and together with St Jerome, the "Foundation Pillar of Latin Christianity¹." This influence was exercised in two ways, 1st, in introducing foreign words and idioms; 2ndly, in the modification of the Latin language itself. The obvious necessity of such coining of words will be apparent, when we consider that the Christian writers had to investigate and refute the tenets of sects, many of whom drew from an Oriental or Platonic source; for instance they had to find equivalents for the Valentinian *πλήρωμα*, *αἶων*, *ὁγδοάς*, for the Platonic *οὐσία*, *τὸ ὄν*, &c. Further, most rites and orders in the Church had an Eastern origin and Greek appellations; hence arose such words as *episcopus*, *acolythus*, *exorcista*, *baptismus*, *eucharistia*, &c. But after all, the modification of the Latin language itself (the second point) is the most important, and, as we mentioned above, is owing in a great degree to the influence of such African writers as Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius, and Augustine.

Certain peculiarities seem to belong to most, if not all, of these². A searching after archaisms³, and that

¹ Cf. Raumer, *Einwirkung des Christenthum*, p. 168.

² On the African dialect, cf. August. *de Enar. Ps.* 123, 138.

³ For examples of archaisms take—

Augustine—Obstrudo for Obtrudo.	Found in Terence, <i>Andr.</i> 1. 5. 15.
„ Præstigiator, Impostor.	„ Plautus, <i>Pœnul.</i> 5. 3. 6.
Tertullian—Prosapia for Progenies.	„ „ <i>Curc.</i> 3. 2. 3.

more in words than sentences, a rather bombastic style (*tumor Africanus*), pervading Lactantius and Augustine least, Arnobius most, "a frequent use of antithesis"—all these keep perpetually reminding us that our authors once taught or studied rhetoric in the capitals of Italy or Africa. But the influence of Augustine was by far the greatest, owing to the important position he has occupied as a theologian and "an interpreter of Scripture," from his own time to the present day. In his writings may be found many of the words which figure in later Latinity, and he gives many signs of coming transformations in the language; his frequent use of rhymes, for instance, anticipates the beautiful sacred Latin poetry of the middle ages. We need only refer to such passages as "lingua clamat, cor amat" (*on Acts* vii. 51, 60); "piscis assus Christus est passus" (*Tract. on Joh.* 123); "quid est enim *fides*, nisi credere quæ non vides?" (*id.* 40). He mentions St Ambrose as the inventor of ecclesiastical hymns, and quotes the one beginning, "Deus creator omnium," in his *Conf. Lib.* ix. c. 32. We also owe to him the introduction of several new words; as *soliloquium*, for the communing with one's self in speech, not in thought merely, as *meditatio* expresses it. *Salvator* as an equivalent for σωτήρ, on the etymology of which he has a discussion in *Serm.* 299. 6. *Transitory* in its present sense of "fleeting,"

Tertullian—Illex, Seductive.	Found in Plautus, <i>Pœnul.</i> 3. 4. 35.
„ Morticulus, Carrion.	„ „ <i>Pers.</i> 2. 4. 12.
„ Rupices, Boors.	„ <i>Lucilius</i> apud Fest.

¹ For antithesis :

Tertul. <i>Apol.</i> c. 50.	"Ad lenonem potius quam ad leonem damnando."
„ „ c. 4.	"Merito damnantur licet damnent."
„ „ c. 2.	"Ut nolint scire pro certo quod se nescire pro certo sciunt."
August. <i>Tract in Joh.</i> xii. 4.	"Superbus ludendo quia deludendo."
„ <i>De Doct. Christ.</i> 5.	"Crescunt errores, crebescunt terrores."

"temporary" (cf. *de Doctr. Christ.* I. § 39). And I shall briefly here subjoin some others which (though he may not have invented them) are found in him first; such are *incarnatio* (*Retr.* II. 7. 1); *contravenio* (*Solil.* I. 28); *recapitulatio* (*de Doctr. Christ.* III. 49); *expressio charitatis*, expression of kindness (II. 54)—nearly English; *intellectualis* (*de Genes.* 12. 7).

With him there is, as Trench observes, no reluctance of the language to yield itself freely to all the uses to which he would put it¹: he displays his mastery over Latin by his familiarity with, and power of distinguishing between, synonyms. Of this power numerous instances may be found in Trench's *Augustin.* p. 27. What some may consider faults in his style, often arise from a desire to make himself better understood by his African countrymen, as he himself sometimes asserts (cf. *de Doctr. Christ.* II. 20, on *floriet* for *florebit*, and III. 7, *ossum* for *os*). On all these accounts his influence in modifying the language was very great, and he well deserved the name of the "second Cicero of the Latin tongue."

I have extended my remarks on this part of my subject (which may perhaps to many seem superfluous, or at least unimportant) further than I had at first intended; for though, for my own part, considering the intimate connexion between Latin and such of the modern languages as I mentioned above, I held that the influence thus really and mightily exerted by Christianity on the Latin tongue, was, in a very great degree, also transmitted to those languages, and therefore was well worthy of being noted in any treatise concerning such influence, I yet thought that the discussion was more technical than suited with the general tone of my previous and, more especially, prefatory remarks. Yet

¹ Trench, *St Augustine as an Interpreter of Scripture.*

such as it is I now leave it, and, with this brief justification, close the *second* grand division of our subject, and proceed to the *third* and last, viz. the influence of Christianity as a book-revelation—in other words, the influence of the Bible on modern language.

CHAPTER III.

INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY AS A BOOK- REVELATION.

NOW the influence exerted in this case is of so much more delicate a nature, and the results so general and indefinite, that we shall in most instances do no more than make a few general remarks, without descending into particular illustrations, more especially as we have already transgressed the limits of space, within which we had wished to confine ourselves.

And first we may notice, that the Bible serves as a useful standard, when translated into the vernacular of a language already formed; and on this subject we have made a few remarks above, when speaking of St Jerome and the Latin of the third and fourth centuries. Many causes conspire to bring this about. The Bible possesses a circulation among all classes, far superior to that of the most popular works; its beauties of expression, as illustrating beauties of thought, impress themselves on the minds of most men, and so influence their conversation and writings. Its phraseology becomes stereotyped, and that by no means exclusively among religious writers; its proverbial expressions are in every one's mouth, and its chaste and simple ideas tend to elevate and purify our ideas, and hence our language. On this point much, very much, might be said by way of comment or illustration, but it would in most cases be no more than a repetition of what will readily offer itself to any reflective mind; and therefore we shall merely adduce as some proof

of our first point, the little change that has taken place in our language within the last 250 years, *i.e.* from the authorised translation in the reign of James I. in 1611, compared with the change from the era of Wiclif to this latter period. Again, as we noticed above, a number of idiomatic and proverbial expressions owe their rise to Bible influence, and this probably in a much greater degree than is capable of actual proof. There are in our language not a few recognised Hebraisms which may possibly be traced to this source; such for instance, as the use of genitives of quality, as *homme d'état*, politician; a man of courage, a courageous man; stout of heart, stout-hearted, compared with **אִישׁ לֵב**; and such Hebraisms we shall find not unfrequent in the Greek of the New Testament writers. In the use of the relative pronoun, there is a singular affinity between English and Hebrew, for in both it may be elegantly omitted, as for instance, "vir ille quem heri vidi," the man I saw yesterday; in Hebrew **הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה**: further, "that" in English serves both for pronoun and conjunction, as does **אֲשֶׁר** in Hebrew; and doubtless a fuller philological acquaintance with our own and other modern languages would discover several other points of resemblance; but let these suffice, for they are enough to shew the influence the Bible has had in promoting the study of its original language, and thus acting through the Hebrew on modern language, in a manner similar to that in which, as we stated above, Christianity influenced Latin through the Roman Law. A third mode in which the Bible has affected modern ideas, is noticed by Humboldt in his *Cosmos*¹, where, alluding to the poverty of what he calls landscape painting in the Latin poets, as compared

¹ Humboldt's *Cosmos*, translated by Col. Sabine, pp. 1—74, in the second volume, more especially 45 and 63.

with the great use our poetical writers make of it, he deduces this change from the sacred poetry of the Hebrew Scriptures, especially marking out such passages as Psalms civ. lxxiv. lxxv.; Ruth; Job xxxviii. xxxix. Allowing there are beautiful descriptions of nature, both in the Greek and Roman poets, he maintains that these are always subordinate to the human agents, and that nature is not described for its own sake, as in the Semitic poetry generally, and in modern authors, among whom he singles out Bernardin de St Pierre (*Paul et Virginie*) and Chateaubriand for especial praise. As this point has been so fully illustrated by him, it will be sufficient to refer the reader to the passage as above quoted, and thus to conclude our remarks on this third head; by which, though certainly we have by no means exhausted the subject, we have, we hope, done enough to vindicate our alluding to it, and to prove that it demands consideration at the hands of any professing to write on our main proposition.

And now we approach the end of our task, with the hope that, imperfectly as it may have been executed, we have not altogether left it as it was before, but have collected some few hints and examples for future amplification and elucidation. The subject indeed demands, for its full treatment, a mind of far higher powers and more extensive reading, one at the same time philosophical, well versed in philological lore, and endued with a competent knowledge, not only of ancient, but also of modern languages. Should this imperfect attempt draw forth a disquisition from such a mind, the purpose of the author will have been amply fulfilled.

APPENDIX.

I HAVE thrown into an Appendix the few following remarks that I had met with in casual reading; because, though I thought they had some reference to the subject in hand, yet I found they did not exactly harmonise with the view I had taken and the manner of treatment to which I had bound myself. I therefore subjoin them here, without any remarks of my own, merely specifying the authorities whence I derived them.

In both cases an alphabet seems to have been invented, to obtain a written copy of the Bible in the vernacular, and, in the last instance, our only knowledge of the language is derived from a MS. of the Gospels in that tongue.

DOBROWSKI, *Institutiones Linguae Sclavicae*.

Constantine called Cyril, and his brother Methodius, bishop of Salzburg, both members of the Greek Church, became missionaries in Moravia and Hungary, and formed the Sclavonic or Sarmatian Alphabet, in order to translate the Scriptures into the vernacular, *circ.* A.D. 860. Cyril translated the New Testament, omitting the Apocalypse, which was not read in the Greek Church, and chose the Greek as the basis of his alphabet, borrowing Coptic and Armenian characters, to express those sounds for which the Greek has no adequate representation.

WELSFORD, *on the English Language*, Cap. vi.

The MS. from which we obtain almost all our knowledge of the Mæso- or Viso-gothic, was discovered in the Abbey of Werden, in Westphalia, and, after many changes, is now in the University Library at Upsal. It contains the four Gospels, somewhat mutilated, and from being written in letters of silver, (with gold initials) is called *Codex Argenteus*. The characters are mostly Greek, with a few Latin. It is a copy of a translation made into the Gothic tongue, *circ.* 360, by Ulfilas, "the Moses of the Goths," a Cappadocian by birth, and an Arian. He introduced this alphabet to supersede the Runic characters, on account of the idolatrous reminiscences connected with these latter.

ESSAY II.

INTRODUCTION.

IT is the favourite maxim of ingenious, but not ingenuous men, that words were invented to disguise thoughts. Scripture, however, which was dictated by One who reads the heart, and knows "what is in man," has taught differently—"out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." A man may wish for private reasons to conceal, and may, *in the particular*, succeed in concealing certain facts known only to himself, but *in the general*, he will be far too incontinent not to give evidence of his manner of life and habit of thinking by the language he makes use of. And hence it will come to pass, that what occupies his thoughts least will tax his utterance least, and what is most on his mind will be most on his lips: and it follows by a natural consequence, that a *change of habits* will be accompanied by a change of language in that person.

Now, inasmuch as a nation is only an aggregate of individuals, what is true of men taken singly is true of man taken collectively—is true of a nation. The tone of a nation's sentiments, the particular value it sets upon particular virtues, the degree of abhorrence with which it views certain vices, or the toleration which it grants them; in short, *its morality* and *its immorality*, both of these may be learnt from its language. What, for example, must we think of a nation (and such a nation exists) whose language contains in it no term to express thankfulness? Would not this fact *by itself* be taken by every rational person as sufficient evidence

that this is a nation which is a stranger to the feeling of gratitude? So again, if by reason of any influence from within or without the moral tone of a nation is exalted or depressed, the result of that influence will be indicated by a corresponding exaltation or depression of the tone of its language: insomuch that a language under the eye of a skilful observer will be of the same use to him in forming his opinion of the character of the nation whose it is, at any particular epoch, as a barometer, when he wishes to ascertain the state of the atmosphere at the time of his observation.

An instance of the effect of the moral degradation of a people on its language has occurred within our own age. The unhappy state of Naples is at the present day the subject of general conversation. Whatever differences of opinion there may be as to the probable issue, it is asserted without contradiction that the evil dominant there is caused by the joint influence of the priesthood and the police, who instigate the lazzaroni to deeds of bloodshed and violence under the pretence of supporting religion and maintaining order. This was a state of things which had never existed before; accordingly, there was no word to express it so long as it did not as yet exist. But when it was brought about, a word sprung up, by which this new phase of wickedness might be called, *Sanfedismo*. The influence which engendered this word may die away; the lazzaroni may be made to cease from the violence of their doings; and then 'Sanfedismo' will undoubtedly fall into disuse; and men of a future age may find the history of the present reign in Naples corroborated by a word which they will perceive to have existed only so long as the evil which they will read of existed, and then to have died with the evil, or to have lived only in the mouths of those who told its sad story.

To shew the truth of what we are endeavouring to enforce, by adducing another well-known example, how significant is the French 'chère amie' and the English 'love-child' of the want of due respect for the institution of matrimony in both countries!

One consideration, which appears to add to the value of the evidence thus afforded of the state of a nation by its language, is the *incidental* nature of that evidence. There can be nothing in it of design. This may be seen in the two examples which we have just given. To add to them one other example, belonging to another age, we may observe the absence of design, of which we are speaking, from the testimony which the word 'danger' bears to the condition of society in the times in which it obtained its present meaning. Danger is the low Latin 'dangerium,' a contraction for 'domi-gerium'.¹ So that when a man fell into the hands of his enemy, and "he took him" prisoner "to his own home," it is evident, from the meaning which 'domi-gerium' has acquired, that he did not consider his life safe. The dead men's bones, and the remains of fetters in the dungeons of some of the feudal castles, shew that such fears were but too well founded.

This signification of the word is humorously alluded to in the following passage of Chaucer's *Romance of the Rose* :—

"Narcissus was a bachelere
That love had caught in his daungere."

Now, design can have had nothing to do with the origin of the present meaning of 'danger:' for the nobles, who practised the enormities above alluded to, must have had too keen a desire to be thought generous to allow such a signification to be attached to 'danger,'

¹ But not derived from it: on the contrary, *domi-gerium* is from danger, and that from *damnum*. Du Cange.

while those subject to them would not dare to express it.

If it be true that the morals, *mores*, of a people may be learnt from its language, it is more certain still that its religion may be discerned from its language, of what sort it is. For a man's religion, or pseudo-religion, or lack of religion, intimately affects, and often completely changes his apparent moral character. If, therefore, morals influence language, and it is religion that gives the tone to morals, the tone of language is due originally to the influence of religion.

If there be one religion of which this may be said with truth more than another, it is Christianity. For very little more can be asserted of all other religions, than that they affect the outward demeanour. Or, where they do more, and penetrate within, they do not *change*. But the very first thing which Christianity does on its reception is to work within, *first* chasing away what had intruded itself, renewing what had corrupted itself, and supplying what was lacking *within*, and then making itself manifest *without*. It must be strange, indeed, if Christianity can completely revolutionise a man, and that this should not appear in his language. Similarly, it must be strange, indeed, if Christianity can completely revolutionise a nation, without also making this appear in its language.

Nor is language a light thing for Christianity to influence. For who is sufficient to speak the praises thereof? Language, the medium of communication between man and man, without which they would stand in no nearer relation either to other than the beasts which perish—language, the medium of communion between God and our race, whereby we may not only hold intercourse with our fellows, dead or living, near or far removed,—that were a small thing,—but may

converse with the Highest, seeking His face with prayer, and receiving an answer of peace!

And how can the importance of Christianity be too highly estimated? Christianity, which is nothing less than the setting forth of, and the doctrine concerning the plan for the restoration of mankind to the Divine favour, and the revelation of God's will and purposes respecting the manner in which they may avail themselves thereof! How can a price be set upon it? For "it is not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father." Nay, it hath the pre-eminence among the works of God; for salvation is more excellent than creation, and regeneration than generation. It behoves us, then, to approach with much reverence while seeking to trace the influence of so wonderful a work of God on so noble a faculty of man—while endeavouring to take a view of "this treasure," which "we have in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us."

But there is also another reason why we cannot approach the intended investigation with self-assurance. The difficulties which attend it are grave. The traces of the influence, which we have taken upon ourselves to seek out, are in many cases obscure, and in many more uncertain. And it may be added, that we shall at times have to venture alone; not from a spirit of fool-hardiness or vain confidence, but simply for lack of any to guide us; nor yet out of idle curiosity, but in obedience to what appears to be the actual requirement of the subject. But we shall avoid hazard as much as we consistently may; and think ourselves happy if we can arrive, though it be with a tottering gait, and too often an uncertain one, at the threshold of the subject: and we shall be well content to view it from thence, and then to tell what we have seen. And if it be found by

any that the way has at times been missed, and false conclusions have been arrived at, he is besought to reflect that this will have happened in the course of a pursuit, which might well tax to the very uttermost the keenest perception and the most matured experience of veteran students.

CHAPTER I.

GOD AND HIS ATTRIBUTES.

- (1) *Ideas conveyed by the Terms used to designate Deity before Christianity.*

IT is not only in the terms and epithets themselves, which were applied to Deity before the influence of Christianity was felt, that we must seek the ideas that were entertained of God by the heathen, but also in their acceptance of those terms.

Thus, if we find a Greek styling Jupiter παντοκρατώρ, and a Roman reverencing him as 'omnipotens,' we are not to conclude from this that he was supposed to reign without fear of a rival, or to enjoy a power which could not be gainsaid. Indeed he could scarcely "rule his own house." When Homer¹ said that Jupiter would have been laid in chains by Juno and her confederate deities, but for the assistance of the hundred-handed giant Briareus, his description was in perfect keeping with the belief of the ancients. In like manner the doctrine of the immortality of their gods was accompanied by a very imperfect conception of their immutability, if not by an absolute disbelief in it. It was from this that Prometheus² derived consolation,

¹ Π. α'.

² Ἦ μὲν ἔτι Ζεὺς, καί περ ἀνθάδῃ φρονῶν
ἔσται ταπεινός, οἷον ἐξαρτύεται
γάμον γαμῆν, ὃς αὐτὸν ἐκ τυραννίδος
θρόνων τ' αἴστον ἐκβαλεῖ· πατρός δ' ἄρα
Κρόνου τότ' ἤδη παντελῶς κραθήσεται,
ἦν ἐκπιτνῶν ἡρᾶτο δηναιῶν θρόνων.

Prom. Vinc.

as he stood rivetted to the rock, with no hope held out to him of ever being set free.

With respect to the ideas conveyed to the ancient Gentile by the word *θεός*, or its equivalent 'deus,' which was adopted by the first teachers of Christianity, it may be observed that Homer represents God (*θεός* or *θεοί*) as ruling mankind; and attributes to him all the good and evil of life, all sudden and unexpected events; so that the notion involved is not only that of destiny, but also of chance, 'high Arbiter.' And he takes the gods as the measure or standard of human virtue, wisdom, or beauty; that is, the beau ideal of every human passion or principle or attribute was deified. These *θεοί* were neither supposed to have existed from all eternity, nor to have sprung into being at one and the same time, but to have been produced in the way of generation. In many cases the history of their generation was not more calculated to inspire virtuous worshippers with reverence, than were the attributes of the deities themselves. Hence, whether a person of devotion might also be looked upon as a person of worth, depended wholly on the deity to whose service he more especially professed to devote himself. This statement is more than borne out by the manner in which the Bacchanalian orgies were celebrated, and by the gross obscenities which were considered indispensable to the festival of the 'Mater deorum.' It is still more corroborated by the fact that persons avowedly immoral claimed to be considered holy, on that very account. Thus, among the Jews a Sodomite was called קרש, a holy person, and an abandoned woman was called קרשה, as being devoted to the service of Astarte, or Venus.

In addition to the fact that there were deities the most disreputable, it may be remarked that many of

the more noble attributes of humanity (as, for example, love properly so called) were altogether unrepresented in the Pantheon of the ancients. And this will not be wondered at, when we consider that it was man, indeed, in his various parts, who was thus deified—man who had been created in the image of God—but it was man, in whom the image of God had been distorted into a mournful caricature; or, to say the least, most grievously marred. The connexion of man with God was slender indeed, till the union of the Godhead and manhood in the person of Christ.

Such were the divinities from which the Gauls, and other nations subject to the Romans, formed their notions of 'deus.' For, no sooner were they reduced to the obedience of Rome, than they had the whole calendar of the gods introduced to them, with all the most recent additions; nor was anything "that was called god, or was worshipped," accounted too common or too unclean to be received into it. For the policy of the Romans was not the policy of Sennacherib: when that conqueror inquired in irony after the gods of the nations whom he had conquered, saying, "Where are the gods of Hamath and Arphad? where are the gods of Sepharvaim?" we do not read that they ventured to appear: they had received rough usage enough already. The Romans, on the other hand, carefully retouched the surface and freshened the tinsel of the deities of their conquered nations, and fully compensated for any indignities which those divinities might have suffered, by making room for them in their own Pantheon. And thus it came to pass, that there was piled up an incredible quantity of rubbish, almost as contemptible as the marine stores which pass current among 'believers' for saintly remains—from the image

which Jupiter¹ let fall, to the black stone which Helio-gabalus the emperor set up. And this vast aggregate was set before one conquered nation after another, with the intimation, "these are thy gods." Now we may ask, what is the impression that would be made by such *θεοί*, "bastards and other," as Faulconbridge would have said? And it was under this system of theology that the European nations² which passed under the yoke of Rome, learnt their first ideas of 'deus,' and had that word introduced into their languages.

But into the most important, in some respects, of the European languages, 'deus,' so far as it is expressive of the person of God, has not entered. Derivatives from it, indeed, and words compounded with it, as 'atheist,' 'theology,' have been introduced; but the one term in use among the various tribes of the modern Teutons is the same as that used by their heathen ancestors for their deities—'God.'

This, viz. 'God,' is the form which that word assumes in Low German, and among ourselves³; in High German it is 'Gott,' in Dutch 'Goed,' in Danish, Swedish, and Icelandic, 'Gud,' and in Gothic 'Goth.' Ottfride wrote it 'Got.'



The general opinion respecting this word is, that it had originally the same meaning as our modern 'good:' if this be the case, it would be difficult to conceive a more beautiful acknowledgment by our heathen forefathers that "there is none good but God." For, side by side with this term for Deity, may be noticed the word used by them and ourselves to

¹ Acts xix, 35.

² 'Deus' is preserved among the Spaniards in the form 'Dios;' in Italian it is 'Dio,' in French 'Dieu,' and in Catalan 'Deu.' The Welsh form of it is 'Duw,' and the Irish 'Dia.'

³ This being the original Anglo-Saxon form.

designate our own species,—‘man;’ a word which in Anglo-Saxon signified also ‘bad.’ But, on the other hand, it must be acknowledged that there was a difference between the Anglo-Saxon pronunciation of ‘God’ and ‘good;’ the Anglo-Saxon for the latter being accentuated by Bosworth, in order to mark that difference, ‘gòd:’ and the same thing has been done to mark the distinction between the significations of ‘man;’ ‘man,’ in the sense of ‘bad’ being ‘màn.’ Probably the difference between ‘God’ and ‘gòd,’ was the same as that between the English ‘God’ and ‘good,’ and between the German ‘Gott’ and ‘gut,’ (pronounced goot). This fact may, perhaps, tend somewhat to shake our belief in the interesting theory just mentioned.

Those who follow Webster wholly reject it, urging that no other nation has named its deities from their goodness¹; that even the Jews, whose knowledge of the person and character of the Almighty was incomparably greater than that of all other nations under heaven, had not one name for Him which contained in it an acknowledgment of his goodness: nay, that even the name whereby He was pleased to designate Himself to them—Jehovah—meant no more than “I am that I am.” On the contrary, they urge, that in most instances the Supreme Being has been named from His power or supremacy, and that the Jewish names of God signified no more: , which is the most ordinary term for God, having the original signification of “a strong, mighty one;” , a scarcely less used term, meaning ‘Lord;’ and the other words in use among the Hebrew, being ‘like unto these’ in signifi-

¹ Webster appears to have overlooked the Roman expression, “Jupiter *Optimus Maximus*,” which was so common among them as to have the same claim to be called a name, that ‘Almighty’ has among ourselves.

cation. But, to put the question beyond doubt, say they, the Persians have a word, 'goda,' which has this very signification of 'ruler:' and from this it is clear that 'God' can have meant nothing else. We shall, however, perhaps be permitted to doubt whether our ancestors were likely to be at the pains to travel so far as to Persia for 'god,' when they found the rest of their language so near home. The matter is not so. If they *did* name their gods from their supposed goodness, it was possibly for the following reason.—The Saxons were "a people that delighted in war:" their valour was their virtue, and success in battle was followed by success at home. Their most highly distinguished leaders were deified, because they appeared to them to have arrived at the climax of excellence. And it is just possible from this circumstance, that they might have named their gods from their goodness, looking on all those who attained not to their achievements as comparatively *men*, or *bad*. On the other hand, if they *did not* contemplate the goodness of their deities when they named them, it was not because they troubled themselves to inquire concerning the usage of other nations, but for a reason of their own. For those deities of theirs did not bear close inspection; a near view of them shewed them to be little better than the *δαίμονες* of the ancients. A Venus¹ was enthroned among them. Malignant deities¹ were among their number.

In either case, therefore, we find 'gods' and '*θεοί*' or 'dei' to have been very similar in character. The Greeks deified man, and the Saxons deified men: the Greeks made gods of their passions, and the Saxons did likewise. Consequently, the same change had to be wrought by Christianity in the acceptance of both these terms.

¹ Sharon Turner's *History of the Anglo-Saxons*.

(2) *The Modification of those Terms by the Introduction of Christianity.*

It may appear remarkable that, although the Most High had been worshipped by the Hebrews under names differing, with one exception (Jove), entirely from those used by the heathen, and Christianity was first preached by men to whom those names must have been dearer than any other that could be given Him, still we find the First Person of the ever-blessed Trinity called Θεός throughout the New Testament. His great names, Jehovah, Elohim, by which he was called in the Old Testament, are not once found in the New.

But this fact,—viz. that, in bringing in an entirely new revelation respecting the Godhead to the heathen world, Christianity did not introduce new names for the Godhead, but adopted those already in use,—accords with the general plan adopted by the Founder of our religion. For the instances are rare in which new terms were coined, or strange words before unknown brought in, that they might designate more forcibly that any already in existence could have done, some great truth or principle. Wherever it could be done, (and it almost always could be done), the doctrines of Christianity were expressed in words already familiar to those to whom they were being explained.

But it must not be supposed that the words put to such new uses were unaffected by them. It would have been as impossible for them to have conveyed the new Christian ideas, without themselves undergoing some kind of change, and renovation, as it would have been out of the question that old bottles could have contained new wine without bursting. And this is pre-eminently the case with the words now under consideration. Jehovah was called Θεός by St Paul, and God by Wiclif and

Luther. But by this means it came to pass that θεός meant more than θεοί; and 'God,' when our Saxon fathers became Christian, designated One unknown before. These words, like those who used them aright, had *existed* indeed before, but now they were, like them, *born again*. Whatever ideas of divinity they might have conveyed before, from henceforth it was enjoined, "thou shalt believe and confess" that "there is none other god but One." That in Him is contained all the fulness of Deity; for "He giveth not His honour to another." That, so far from being "overcome of evil," as had been vainly imagined, He "overcomes evil with good." And that this one God is "everlasting, without body, parts or passions: of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the Maker and Preserver of all things, both visible and invisible."

(3) *Introduction of New Terms by the same means.*

When an entirely new truth has to be taught, there can obviously be no word in the language to express it. To do so the teacher has three courses open to him. He may either introduce a word from another language; or he may adapt a word to the particular sense in which he wishes to employ it, for which he finds some analogy in its general signification, as formerly employed; or, he may find it necessary to coin an entirely new term. Each of these courses has been adopted in making known the fundamental article of our belief, that "in the unity of the Godhead there be three persons." This was not definitely expressed, although it had all along been clearly implied, till the second century, when Theophilus of Antioch¹, a Greek father, adopted the word τριάς, which had been used by Plato to signify the number

¹ See *Theophilus ad Autolyicum*.

three. His object was to bring into use among the orthodox a term which might mark the three Persons as distinct; such a step having become necessary by reason of the opinion of the Unitarians of the day, who held that the Son and Spirit are mere emanations from the Father. Tertullian, when he wished to express the same thing in Latin, not finding any term at all in that language which might convey his meaning, made of the Greek *τριάς* the Latin *trinitas*, a word unknown to the classical Roman writers. And this word is in use at the present day in those European languages which are either wholly or in part derived from the Latin.

But by far the most comprehensive term for the Trinity was coined, or rather, one might almost have said, sprung up spontaneously from that most fertile of all the European languages, the German. What can express more briefly, more comprehensively, more beautifully, the Trinity in unity, the Tri-unity, than 'Dreieinigkeit?' 'Trinitatis,' as the genitive of *trinitas*, is not unknown among the Germans, but it has not been adopted into their language, and is chiefly used to designate the festival of the Church which bears that name.

It was a happy thought that first suggested *Kύριος* as a term whereby to designate Jesus Christ. For, although He is God, yet is He not God alone; and, although he is man, yet is He not man alone. *Kύριος*, being a term which had been used by the ancients for both gods and men (though but rarely for the former), expressed both his natures. It was adopted as being the best word to express *אֲדֹנָי*, which, as we have already seen, was in frequent use as a name of God, while the same word, a little modified, was used as often as an honourable term for men. The nations of Europe, as they became Christian one after another, used each its word which had the signification 'Lord' in the same sense

as that which *Kύριος* obtained, as a title of reverence for the Saviour. Thus the French have so used "Seigneur," the Germans "Herr," our own nation "Lord," &c.

Now, although it is true that these terms are not *new in themselves*, yet it is likewise true that they are *new in this their application*. For Jesus Christ did not exist *as man* till He came into the world. These words, therefore, could not have been used in a sense approximating ever so slightly to that which Christianity has given them, viz. to designate God-man, God manifested in the flesh.

(4) *Fate.*

There is an article in the creed of the ancients of such singular importance, that it seems to deserve a separate notice. It is *their belief that even Jupiter himself was under the control of Destiny*. And, although the precise nature of that destiny was "hid from their eyes," yet the names whereby it was known among them are full of interest.

The Greeks called it *Μοῖρα*, and the Romans 'Fatum.' Now, *Μοῖρα* is, perhaps, best expressed in our language by the word 'dispensation;' while Horne Tooke¹ observes of 'Fatum' that it is the past participle of the verb 'fari:' and if so, it is correctly rendered by 'word.'

Here then we have, on the part of the Greeks, an acknowledgment of the supremacy of the Divine dispensation over all things both visible and invisible; while the Romans "believed and confessed" that all "thrones, dominations, potentates, and powers," are subject to the Word of God.

The fact of their having, notwithstanding this, paid supreme reverence to Jove, shews that this their belief

¹ *Diversions of Purley.*

was only the decayed remnant of a more perfect knowledge. It is highly probable that the name "Jove" (Jehovah) was learnt at some early period from the Jews¹ by the Greeks and Romans, and that his omnipotence was taught with his name. It may also be supposed that the consequence was, that "Jove" was worshipped as supreme among their Gods; while, at the same time, they were too far gone in polytheism to believe it possible that any single god could be absolute. Accordingly, the *Word of God and His dispensations* were "removed far above out of their sight;" and if they worshipped them, they "worshipped they knew not what."

(5) *On the Attributes of God.*

It is the just consolation of the godly, and the self-deluding reflection of the ungodly, that God is merciful; but it is highly probable that, so far as its literal meaning is concerned, neither the one nor the other fully understand the words, "I will have *mercy*, and not sacrifice," for, taken literally, this would be a contradiction. *Mercy*², the French *mercie*, and the Italian *merce*, is from *merx*, and the low Latin *merciare*. The Norman

¹ Possibly the Greeks learnt it through the Phœnicians; and the Romans derived their notions of fate from the Etruscans, who might themselves have obtained them from the Phœnicians. It may be remarked that the oblique cases of Jupiter (*i.e.* Ju-pater), Jovis... are, in the opinion of the highest authorities, the very same as the oblique cases of Ζεύς, viz. Διός.... In other words, the Greek name for their Supreme Deity is the same as the Roman one for theirs; if one, therefore, is derived from 'Jehovah,' so is the other also.

² This may be illustrated by the history of the word 'ransom.' 'Ransom' was anciently written also 'ranson;' French, rançonner; Dutch, ranscen; German, ranzeon. It is compounded of *ran*, rapine, and *süne*, redemption: from its original signification of *redemption of plunder*, it came to mean the price of liberty. The German *sune*, and Gothic *saun*, are used for the act of reconciliation.—RICHARDSON.

French *amercier*, means to amerce, or to mercy, *i. e.* impose or exact a recompense. Thus, 'to cry mercy,' was to beg for life; and to grant mercy was to spare life. Minshew produces from an old statute of Henry VI. the expression "To be in grievous *mercie* of the king," *i. e.* "to be in hazard of a great *penaltie*." And the word is used in the same sense by Blackstone:

"Therefore it is considered that the same William and his pledges of presenting, to wit, John Doe and Richard Roe, *be in mercy* for his false complaint¹."

Thus is expressed in one word, and that used for quite a different purpose, the fact that the penalty must be paid, for God "will by no means clear the guilty," which may be gathered from the original meaning of the word: and from the present acceptation of the term may be learnt the fact, that, the penalty being paid, we may now look for pardon.

The influence of Christianity is equally discernible in the etymology of the word "holy²." For it is from the same root as the German word "heilig," which means the same thing. *Heilen*, the root referred to, has the same signification with, and is, in fact, the same word as "heal." And "Heil," salvation, is derived from it also. How just a conception this word contains in it of the sanctity of God as revealed by Christianity! Recognising Him not only as holy in Himself, but as "*making every whit whole*" them that come unto him!

And herein "*the righteousness* of God without the law was manifested," in that, when He imposed a penalty for sin, He required its payment to "the uttermost farthing." And "in this was manifested *the love* of God towards us," in that, when we "had nothing to pay," He remitted the whole, defraying it at His own charges;

¹ Blackstone, *Commentaries*, III. App. I. p. 6.

² The Anglo-Saxon, halig, halga, and Swedish hel.

and not sparing, when we had forfeited our lives, to "send His only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through Him."

It has been seen from the words "mercy" and "holy" how our forefathers both appreciated and understood these Divine truths.

CHAPTER II.

FUTURE STATE.

(1) *The World of Spirits.*

THE ancients were not ignorant that there is a future state. They had their Hades and their Tartarus, their judges of departed spirits, their Charon, their Pluto. They were taught that the virtuous would be rewarded, and the vicious punished. But, after all, they were much in the dark. Their conceptions resulted rather from speculation than belief. Accordingly, they set a greater value on the present life, than on a future one,—on what was certain than on what was uncertain. Their maxim, for the most part, was “*carpe diem.*” “Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.” As for our ancestors, whose notions of a future state must have been derived from independent sources, they were in no better case. The following interesting passage out of Sharon Turner¹ contains a touching description of their uncertainty in this particular.

“Edwin, King of Northumbria, held a council on the propriety of suffering the preaching of Christianity in his dominions. One of the speakers delivered himself thus:—‘The present portion of our existence, O King, compared with the uncertain future, seems to me to resemble the temporary appearance of a sparrow at your winter-feasts, when your generals and ministers are around you. Gay with the warmth of your central fire, it hears the hurrying rain and snow beating without, and for a while is happy. When serener skies approach, the little guest disappears: and, as it came

¹ *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, Vol. I. p. 279.

we know not whence, it goes we know not where. Such is the life of man. For a short time it appears in the busy world, revels with hilarity, and is active from its enjoyment of existence. Soon the passing scenes terminate; and as of those which may have preceded this life we are ignorant, so we know nothing of the events which are to follow. In this state of ignorance, of doubt, of alarm, I feel, that if this new doctrine contains in it something more certain and more consolatory, it deserves our assent.”—*Bede*.

A thick veil¹, then, was cast over futurity, and consequently their insight into it was dim.

Owing to their uncertainty, and, at the same time, to their misconceptions of Deity, they were in utter ignorance of the nature of the spiritual agency at work to further their future well or ill being.

¹ That even Cicero, lofty as his imagination was, did not feel himself *established* in what he imagined concerning his then future being, may be seen from the following passage:—

“O præclarum diem, cum ad illum divinum animorum concilium cœtumque proficiscar, et cum ex hâc turbâ et colluvione discedam! Proficiscar enim non ad eos solum viros, de quibus ante dixi; sed ad meum Catonem, quo nemo vir melior natus est, nemo pietate præstantior; cujus a me corpus crematum est, quod contrâ decuit ab illo meum. Animus vero non me deserens, sed respectans, in ea profectò loca discessit, quò mihi ipsi cernebat esse veniendum; quem ego meum casum fortiter ferre visus sum; non quod æquo animo ferrem; sed me ipse consolabar, existimans, non longinquum inter nos digressum et discessum fore.”

With this we may contrast the words which immediately follow:—

“His mihi rebus, Scipio, (id enim te cum Lælio admirari solere dixisti) levis est senectus; nec solum non molesta, sed etiam jucunda. QUOD SI IN HOC ERRO, QUOD ANIMOS HOMINUM IMMORTALES ESSE CRE- DAM, LUBENTER ERRO; *nec mihi hunc errorem, quo delector, dum vivo, extorqueri volo*. Sin mortuus (ut quidam minuti philosophi censent) nihil sentiam, non vereor, ne hunc errorum meum mortui philosophi irrideant; quod si non sumus immortales futuri, tamen extinguì homini suo tempore optabile est.”—Cic. *De Senectute*.

It is true that they believed in the existence of numberless benevolent spirits, which they believed to have dominion over woods, springs, rivers, seas; and that they sought their protection. It is equally true, that they dreaded malignant spirits. But they looked on all these as so many *independent members* of a superior race of beings, each of which, for his part, was as much lord of the human race as they were individually "lords of all beside."

Hence, when the Seventy, in rendering the Hebrew text of the Old Testament into Greek, sought a word by which to express God's ministering spirits, they found none. And so they *adopted* a word, ἄγγελος, as being an exact translation of מַלְאָכִים, by which angels were designated in holy writ. And it may be observed, that although ἄγγελος was used even so early as Hesiod in the sense of "messenger of the gods," when coupled with θεῶν, yet it had not, standing by itself, the Christian signification above referred to.

This word, however, was not at once lifted out of its ordinary meaning. It occurs in the Septuagint as frequently in its meaning of messenger, as when it is used in its present sense. And even in the New Testament it is as indiscriminately used as מַלְאָכִים had been in the Old. Insomuch, that in one passage¹ where the word occurs, it is still disputed whether St Paul meant angels, in our acceptation of the term, or mere human beings.

Indeed, it is Schleusner's opinion², that the persons there meant were Pagans sent by their party to spy out the manner of their "assembling themselves together."

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 10: διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς διὰ τοὺς ἁγγέλους.

² Schleusner's *Lexicon in Novum Testamentum*.

But, to whatever other uses the word ἄγγελος may have been put by Christian writers, it cannot be denied that they so constantly employed it as the generic term for Cherubim and Seraphim, that now it has come to mean nothing else, whenever it is used in a good sense. The Greek Fathers used it, the Latin Fathers adopted it, and we have it from them¹.

Thus, then, it is evident that our ancestors were ignorant of the fact that God has *attendant* spirits, and that it is their high function to minister to man with *a view to his future well being*; nay, so concerned are they about it, that "there is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth."

In like manner, it will be seen that the ancients were in ignorance of the nature of those *evil* angels, the "messengers of Satan," who make it their chief concern to compass the ruin of our race, and "rest not day and night" from decoying men into sin, and then accusing them for it before God, that He may "cast them into perdition."

The gradual appropriation of the word διάβολος to its present use by Christianity, is exactly similar to that of ἄγγελος. By the heathen classical writers, it was applied only to beings "that have flesh and bones." It occurs in the Septuagint² for ἰσῶ. But διάβολος does not always stand for "the accuser of the brethren" even in the New Testament. Thus St Paul³ desires that *wives* may be μὴ διαβόλους. Still, for the most part ὁ διάβολος meant none other than the devil. And from having been used in this sense by our Lord and his immediate disciples, it was used in no other by the

¹ The Germans, who are somewhat chary of receiving words from other languages, were driven, for want of a term of their own, to adopt ἄγγελος; the form in which they use it being 'Engel.'

² Job i. 6.

³ 1 Tim. iii. 2.

generations of Christians which came after. The word must have been in very general use to designate the enemy of mankind, otherwise, when Jerome used it, *Greek* as it is, in his *Latin Vulgate*, he would not have been understood by those of his readers who knew the latter language, but were unacquainted with the former.

This word, thus put to an entirely new use by Christianity, was received by all Christian nations¹, *there being in their languages no term to express what they did not know, till they learnt it from Christianity.*

It may not be uninteresting to mention, in connexion with this word, that *fiend* properly and originally signified "enemy," in which sense and no other, "feind" is used by the Germans at the present day. And this is the meaning, too, of *fiend*.

Thus may the belief, then, of Christians in the connexion of man with the world to come, be learned from the nature of the terms used by them to designate the world of spirits.

Further "the *sure and certain hope*" which the Christian feels that death is not the end of life, may be seen from the modern employment of the word *resurrectio*², and its Teutonic equivalent *Auferstehung*. It received its present signification in the earliest ages of Christianity; and Tertullian has entitled one of his tracts, *De Resurrectione carnis*.

¹ In Welsh it is *diavol*, in Irish *diabal*, French *diable*, and in the Teutonic languages it also appears; its form in Low German being *düvel*, in Dutch *duivel*, English *devil*, and German *Teufel*.

² With the Romans 'resurgo' signified only *rursum surgere post casum aut accubitum*.

"Victa tamen vinces, eversaue Troja resurges."

Ov. *Fast.* i. 523.

(2) *The future Abodes of Man.*

Although Christ promised, that "there is nothing *covered* which shall not be revealed," still "the time is not yet." Much still remains *covered*, and is not yet revealed, in order to try our faith. And this is the case respecting the future abodes of man. Sufficient, indeed, has been revealed for the purpose of Christianity, but *all* has not yet been made known to mankind.

Hence, when St Paul was caught up into the third heaven, what he heard were "unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter¹." "As it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." And when St Paul adds immediately after this his quotation, "But God hath revealed them to *us* by His Spirit²," he must be considered to except those mysterious *particularities* which were only revealed to *himself*, and which he was *forbidden to make known to others*.

The same remark is applicable to the revelations which have been made respecting the future abode of the lost.

Now, this ignorance on the part of Christians of the *precise nature* of the future abodes of men, is accompanied by a corresponding indefiniteness in the terms in use among ourselves to designate them. For *heaven*, according to Horne Tooke³, is "some place, any place, heav-en or heav-ed." Indeed a more indefinite word could hardly have been selected. For

"They say that this word *heaven* in the article of our faith, *ascendit ad cœlos*, signifieth no certaine and determinat place. Som tyme it signifieth only the

¹ 2 Cor. xii. 4.² 1 Cor. ii. 9.³ *Diversions of Purley*, II. 75.

suppre place of creatures." *A Declaration of Christ*, by John Hooper. 1547.

Not very much more definite is *paradise*, which our Lord himself made a Christian term, and Christian nations have adopted as such.

The Teutonic word for the place of future punishment (our *hell*), indicates in its etymology yet more strikingly that, whatever else may have been *revealed*, *that* is still in a great measure among the things which *are covered*. For it is derived from 'helen,' or 'to heal,' which anciently meant *to cover*¹; the German *hüllen*, whence comes their word '*hölle*,' still has that meaning.

¹ It is still used in this sense in Kent.

CHAPTER III.

MAN IN HIS MORAL CONDITION.

(1) *Just Relations established between the different Classes of Society.*

WHEN Christianity began to take root in an individual or a nation, it effected something more than a mere change of opinion respecting certain theological facts. It wrought a great moral convulsion, prostrating what had before seemed entitled to exaltation, and raising from its low estate what had been "trodden down of the Gentiles."

Our only concern, in the present instance, with these revolutions in the received standards of right and wrong, of worth and its opposite, of splendour and obscurity, is to observe the corresponding changes which were wrought by their means in the language of modern Europe.

To begin with considering some of the terms which have been, and are in use to signify *man*, it may be observed, that there are in most languages two words, both signifying 'man,' between the meanings of which there is, nevertheless, a manifest difference.

In Hebrew אָדָם denoted a person of whom nothing more particular could be said than that he was a man; while אֱלֹהִים was a person more or less honourably distinguished above the common herd. A similar distinction existed between ἀνθρωπος and ἀνὴρ, and between 'homo' and 'vir.'

But the Teutons made a still more striking difference between these two classes of men. *Man*, which had with them, in the early ages, the same meaning

that it now has among ourselves, signified also, as we have seen¹, *bad, evil*.

Besides this term there was another, *wer*, which was nearly equivalent to the Latin *vir*. Its forms in the old German are *wer, war, waar, ber, baro*. In Icelandic it takes the form *ver*, and has the signification of 'husband;' in Moes. it is *wair*; the Welsh have *gwr, vir*, a husband, (probably from the Latin 'vir') in Irish Gaelic, *fear*, plur. *fir*, has the same meaning. A modification of this word is 'baron;' which, although it has ceased to have a place in the modern languages², except as a title of nobility, still is of interest as shewing the class of persons it had once designated.

Wer is also preserved to us in another word, which, so far from growing obsolete, has become a term of importance,—I mean *world*, a contraction from the old form 'woruld,' 'weoruld.' The German form is *welt*, and the Dutch, *wereld*; in Freisic, it is *wrald, wrauld, wraald, wrualt*; Kero writes, *uueralt*; the Danish is *verda*; the Swedish, *werld*; and the Icelandic, *veröld*; from *wer*, and *old*, an old Danish word signifying *æcum, ætas*.—From *wer* may also be derived *worth*, as is more clearly seen in the German form *Wür-de*.

Now, the second meaning of the word *man*, just alluded to, is such that it is in the highest degree improbable that any one would apply it to himself. It must have been, in fact, a term of reproach or contempt given by the *wer* to the "man of low degree," by the lord to the serf. Whether 'man' came to mean 'evil' *after* it had the signification it still retains, or not, does not materially affect the present inquiry. For in either case the opinion which the *wer* affected to entertain of the *man* is only too manifest.

¹ Chapter I. p. 43.

² So *baron* and *femme*, law terms; and the Spanish *varon*.

Somewhat similar to these two terms, but less general in their application, were 'earl' and 'carle.' The latter, being applied to an oppressed race, soon came to express a degraded one; and although Charlemagne ennobled it in his own person, still he did not rescue it from falling into the form and signification of 'churl,' in which it remains to this day. With the Germans it is 'kerl;' which, though it is sometimes used in a good sense, like our word "fellow," yet for the most part carries with it an unfavourable opinion of the person to whom it is applied.

To these two classes of men may be traced many words now wholly independent of them. We propose to illustrate the distinction above pointed out, with a consideration of a few of these terms, in order to set in a clear light what Christianity effected when it ceased to be merely nominal.

To begin with terms which belong to the upper class, we may notice the Anglo-Saxon word 'ranc,' which signified 'proud.' It is manifest from the present meaning of the word *rank*, to which division of society that was applied. What an insight does it not give us (and that too quite incidentally) into the state of men at that period! It probably was assumed by the 'high,' for the 'low' had not much to say for themselves.

To this good opinion which the nobles entertained of themselves, we owe the present meaning of the word *frank*. To be a *Frank*, was to be a frank person. *Generosity*¹ and *ingenuous* were formed under the like prejudices from "genus." And from these two last-mentioned words it may be seen, that it is not in the Teutonic languages only that we find a great gulf fixed

¹ Generous had not lost its signification of 'noble by birth' even in Shakspeare's time; for he used it in that sense:

"The *generous* and gravest citizens." *Measure for Measure*.

between the two great divisions of men, the high and the low. In like manner 'gentle' and 'simple,' 'gentiles' and 'simplices,' are Latin terms; and the first of them, at least, had the meaning which it now has before the death of that language. 'Gentilis' was 'one of a gens'; and a 'gentle' man or woman was, among our forefathers, one of a family of note, illustrious, if not noble. A 'simple' person, on the other hand, was one of whom when it was said that he was a man, all had been said.

Thus far well enough. But that *gentleness* should come to be esteemed a virtue, and *simplicity* to mean culpable folly, indicates, one would think, if not an unhealthy state of society, at least such a state of things as is disallowed by Christianity.

There is a word, however, which seems to belong to both classes of men. It is craft. The original signification of this word, which is *strength*, or, less frequently, *ability*, is still in use among the Germans, who retain the term in the form 'Kraft.' Among ourselves this meaning may still be seen in the word handicraft.

From the above signification of 'craft,' and 'crafty',¹ we may gather that not only nobles, but also commoners, might be possessed of 'craft,' *i.e.* either strength or ability, in a greater or less degree. But there was nothing of "cunning craftiness" or "crafty wiliness" implied in the word in the first instance. It is therefore as certain as the history which corroborates this statement, from the meaning which men in those days learnt to attach to this word, that "every man according to his several ability" sought only to serve his own interests, though it might be at the expense of his principles.

¹ The A. S. *craftig*.

The powerful were crafty in the use of their power, and the skilful, if they could overreach, happy were they. Next of kin to 'crafty' is 'cunning;' for this must be fathered too on society in general: it is from 'can,' the German 'können,' as if *canning*. It simply means, therefore, one who has it in his power to do this or that injury or benefit.

It is sufficiently evident, from the present signification of the word, how advantage was wont to be taken of such power in the days when that signification arose.

If the epithets applied by the higher class to their own order, betray the good opinion they entertained of themselves, it will be seen, from the meanings which they have given to the following terms, that they were at no pains to conceal their contempt for the lower class.

Calling to mind the words 'worth,' and 'generosity,' one of which, as we have seen, took its rise from the Teutonic *aristo*-cracy, and the other from that of the Romans, and the nations formerly subject to them, let us contrast with these the word *villain*, the French *vilain*, the Italian *villano*, and the Spanish *villanchon*. 'Villain,' or, more properly 'villein,' and its kindred in other languages, signified in the early ages simply a husbandman, one whose dwelling was in a village, and whose occupation was on the soil. Its present meaning need not now be further remarked upon, than that it was given to the word in the dark ages. It may, however, be illustrated by the following French proverb:

"Oignez vilain, il vous poindra,
Poignez vilain, il vous oindra."

which may be freely translated thus:

Tend a villain, and he'll rend you
Use him ill, and he'll attend you.

Other words belonging to the same category, as 'clown,' 'boor' (the German Bauer, and Dutch boor¹), have been more innocently dealt with; but even here there was much for Christianity to amend. That this amendment has taken place, is evident from the absence of opprobrium from the ideas conveyed by the terms in use for agriculturists at the present day.

Again, 'varlet,' which meant originally no more than serving-man, has fared little better than 'villain' in the hands of people who knew no other law than their own will in their relations with those in their power.

The word 'knave' (the A. S. cnapa, cnafa, the Dutch knape, and German knabe) meant originally nothing more than what it still signifies in German—boy. In time, the meaning which is now the only one remaining to it, grew up side by side with its original one; inso-much, that, like other words of this kind, it was used both in a good and a bad sense. Thus, Wiclif attaches no ill-meaning to it in the following translation which he has made:

"And she bare a *knave* child (*male* child), that was to reulynge all folkis in an yrun gherde." Apocalypse xii. 5. If we add to 'knave' 'arrant,' and remember that 'arrant' is no more than 'errant,' we shall see that 'arrant knave,' properly speaking, meant nothing more or less than 'errand-boy.' This being so, it is no small proof of the disesteem in which, whether rightly or wrongly, the condition of servitude was held.

To these words we may add the term 'artful,' which belongs originally, one would think, entirely to the humbler class. The meaning which it now bears makes it evident that there were times when artisans were not content with being diligent in business, whatever may

¹ This term, however, is used by the Dutch in a good sense.

be the case now; but they must needs practise other than their lawful calling, and employ arts which had in them more of skill than of honesty, whereby to eke out their just earnings.

We come now to a word with the present signification of which the nobles had nothing whatever to do. It is 'lewd.' Horne Tooke says, that "'lewd' is the past participle, and 'lay' the past tense, and therefore past participle of the A. S. *Læthan*, *prodere*, *tradere*¹." But there seems more of probability in the derivation which is generally given for these two words, viz. *λαός*, *λαϊκός*; and that chiefly, because it² is an ecclesiastical term as ancient as Tertullian, which was used to denote all who were not of the sacred orders. As the clergy were, for the most part, the only persons of any learning in the early ages, and "wisdom died with them," *lay* came to mean *unlearned*.

"Mysteries are barred from laie eyes."

Rochester upon Nothing. (RICHARDSON.)

And that *lay* and *lewd* are both from the same root, may be seen by comparing the following two versions of the same passage.

"When they saw the boldness of Peter and John, and understode that they were vulnered men and *lay* people, they marueyled." Bible 1551, Acts, chap. iv.

Wiclif has rendered it thus: "It was foundun that theie weren men unlettrid, and *lewde* men." 'The Dedis of Apostlis.'

The present meaning of 'lewd' needs no illustration. At the same time it may not be uninteresting to observe, that 'lay' is used in a bad sense by the continental nations, without having lost its original signification. The Spanish '*lego*' means both 'layman' and an illiterate

¹ *Diversions of Purley*, II. p. 383.

² i. e. *lay*, *laicus*.

person. The Italian '*laico*' has the signification of 'idiot,' 'unlearned.' The German *laie* is an everyday word in the same signification.

The passage which our translators have rendered "how shall he that occupieth the room of the *unlearned* say Amen at thy giving of thanks" (1 Cor. xiv. 16), will be found, accordingly, to contain *laie* in the sense of *unlearned*.

Now, as for the *origin* of the *present* signification of 'lewd,' we must either suppose that the laity were so conscious of their own depravity, as to be aware that it amounted to something more than could be expressed in gentle terms, and so humbled by their consciousness, as to be willing that the very word which designated them, should also stand for this their universal proneness to sin, or we are driven to the conclusion that the clergy, not content with reserving to themselves the appellation 'religious,' thus stigmatised their brethren; as if they had said to them "stand by thyself, for I am holier than thou." The clergy, then, were not one whit behind the nobles in giving expression to their high opinion of themselves, and their mean estimate of those who were not of themselves. And there is no reason to believe that the commons would have been less opprobrious, had they been allowed a voice in the matter.

From what has gone before, it is manifest that, in the early ages of Christianity (whatever may have been the case in the *earliest* ages), in our land and in other countries, the bands which held society together, were either too loose to serve their purpose, or else so tightly drawn, as to gall those whom they bound: that the relations between the different classes of a community were either straitened by prejudice, or else prostituted to wrong ends, for the sake of interest falsely so called.

But, it may be said, all this came to pass under the auspices of Christianity, or, at least, it was not done away by the introduction of Christianity. To this it may be answered, that if Christianity was the cause of these things, then it taught what it condemns, and fostered what it labours to root out.

The fact is, that Christianity, so far as it was more than nominal, did not make its spirit sufficiently felt to affect the general relations of life. It lay dormant. When it did arise and shine, it speedily chased away the darkness; and then everything that exalted itself was as speedily seen to be base, and what had been laid low, rose to its level without more ado; and "the Lord alone was exalted in that day." By the influence of Christianity it came to pass that a man of 'rank' is not necessarily a proud person; that a 'villain' may be as 'ingenuous' as a noble, that none should be called a 'churl,' or 'kerl,' till he had proved himself such, and that the 'lewd' might be 'religious' without the imposition of hands;—none was to have a reputation for lewdness or generosity, for knavery or ingenuousness, unless he had first earned it.

In a strictly civil point of view, society was not affected by Christianity; morally it was completely revolutionised. And of this revolution we have observed some unmistakeable traces in the languages of those nations who were affected by it.

(2) *Fellowship.*

It is not only in the changes effected in the mutual feelings of the *great divisions of society* towards each other, that we may trace the influence of Christianity. If we go from the place of concourse to the family hearth, we shall find that the moral force of Christianity

has been felt there also. The leaven had not merely transformed the outward appearance; it had "leavened the whole lump."

And this may be best seen by a consideration of some of the words, which express the closer relations of life. Thus:

Kind, although it may not at first sight appear to be a word in the meaning of which any the least degree of selfishness can possibly lurk, yet falls very far short of that charity which regards even an enemy as a neighbour. For it is a contraction for *kinned*. If this word, then, ever had an original meaning, it *must* have been one which conveyed the idea that at the time when it sprung up charity not only began at home, but that it ended there: and that men were not content with making no secret of the fact, that what sympathy they felt was bestowed, and that exclusively, on their own kindred, but actually framed a word to express this.

Such being the received notion of 'kindness,' it follows, necessarily, that it must have been considered as much an act of kindness to injure one who was unfriendly, as to confer a benefit on one favourably disposed towards the clan or kin of the bestower—to save the life of a brother as to take the life of a foe. The Germans have a word, *gun-st*, from the same root, and having the same signification as 'kindness,' while its derivation shews that its original meaning must also have been the same as that of 'kindness.'

Now the false feeling here alluded to has died away both among the Germans, and among ourselves; accordingly the original meanings of both '*gun-st*' and '*kindness*' have died away also.

But, with the Italians it is not so. So manifest, indeed, has been the unhappy nature of the *kindness*

which that nation is wont to entertain, that some ingenious etymologists have gone so far as to believe that 'goblin,' the French 'gobelin,' is derivable to 'Gibelline,' the name of a powerful faction in Italy, while Guelph, the name of the family hostile to the Gibellines, is supposed to have given rise to 'elf.' However much of childishness there may be thought to be in such a derivation, yet it is a mournful fact, that the moral grounds for it are too well established to make it appear altogether absurd. So too the play of *Romeo and Juliet*, founded as it is on actual fact, furnishes the English reader with only too conclusive evidence, that, whatever the influence of Christianity may have effected to make families of one mind in a nation, it has not prevailed in Italy. No marvel, if these things are so, that the Italians have a proverb :

" Vendetta, boccon di Dio¹."
Vengeance, a morsel for God.

Now, it may be asked, what is our concern with all this? We answer, that it is our object to shew that this lack of influence *on the nation* is accompanied by a lack of influence *on the language*. And this we shall endeavour to do.

The word 'generous,' although it belongs to those words which have reference to a whole class of society, yet must also be allowed to admit of a somewhat narrower application, and, indeed, to be equivalent to the Teutonic 'kind.' Now it is true that 'generoso,' the Italian form of that word, has not lost the good meanings which obtained among the Romans; but, at the same time it is also true, that it is tainted by the feeling spoken of above. For an Italian, who could not be expected to describe that as a crime, which he has from

¹ Trench, on *Lessons in Proverbs*.

infancy been taught to look upon as an excellence, has given the following definition of 'generoso,'—"Il generoso animo dalla sua origine tratto *non aveva ella* IN COSA ALCUNA *diminuito*." The mode of application of this principle has already been alluded to. The French 'générosité,' on the other hand, is utterly free from any such signification, and that simply because the nation, as such, is utterly free from any such feeling.

There is a word which is to be found in all those languages which are derived from the Latin, and which has been very materially influenced by Christianity, I mean 'member,' the French 'membre,' Spanish 'miembro,' &c. *Membrum*, the original word, did not of old number among its meanings that metaphorical and mystical one which we meet with in the New Testament. Nor did μέλος, of which it is a translation. But it was by no means to lose its literal signification on the accession of the new one. When St Paul bade the Colossians (chap. iii. ver. 5) "mortify their members which were on the earth," he obviously referred to the members as different parts of the natural body. At the same time he "magnified their office;" for they were to be mortified, not annihilated, in order that "their life (the converts') being hid with Christ in God," they might become "the body of Christ, and members in particular."

This closeness of union between Christ and them that "worship Him in spirit and in truth" necessarily brought about a corresponding unity among the worshippers themselves. This membership "one of another" has been not unaptly alluded to by Beaumont in his *Psyche*:—

"But O, that man, whose mystic obligation
Of mutual membership doth them invite
To careful tenderness and free compassion,
With such confederate zeal and stout delight
To help their brethren up the heavenly hill,
As these contrive to plunge them deep in hell."

Hence the ties which bound society in general together were drawn closer. Not only were the individuals who belonged to the same church members one of another, and those churches, so composed, in their turn members one of another, but the same feeling obtained in *social life*. Father, mother, sister, brother, were from henceforth to look on themselves as *members* of the family to which they belong; a thing which had not so much as been "named among the Gentiles." The Teutonic languages, as they have admitted but few Latin words into their vocabularies, so have they not received 'membrum.' But they have a word 'glied', whereby they express this 'mystic obligation,' and 'glied' is an exact translation of 'membrum;' and the original and still existing signification is 'limb.' A more usual term in German for 'member' in this metaphorical sense is 'mitglied;' a form in which the new signification is rather strengthened than weakened, the addition of 'mit' making it equivalent to the middle Latin 'commembris.'

It may be asked, whence comes it that *membrum* is found in Italian with what may be called its Christian signification, so long as the feuds of their rival families and their cherished animosities are so many—so long as every clan's hand is against every clan's, so long as their slain fall in their streets, and all these things are brought about by the cruel devices of *professed members one of another*? Is not such an influence, which wrought such a change in such a country, a mere wordy influence, and not a real one, λόγῳ μὲν, ἔργῳ δ' οὐ?

We would answer, that the feeling which preserves to 'membro' its metaphorical meaning is not the same as that which gave rise to it.

¹ *Glied* is the German form of it; it varies slightly in the other Teutonic languages.

The Italian 'credo' may be summed up in a few words,—“*Extra palum ecclesiæ nulla salus.*”—To be *members of the church*, then, is the “one thing needful.” But it so happens, that, in that particular church, the ‘mystic obligation of membership’ is not a *mutual* obligation, but an obligation to the church, and to the church alone. Hence, then, it comes to pass, that the sinews which had held together the members to one another and to the Head are unstrung. A plentiful variety of members exists, and the aggregate of them is for the sake of euphony called ‘The Church,’ ‘The body of Christ.’ The nature of the attachment of these members to one another has, however, been seen, “of what sort it is.”

As ‘*member*’ had its signification extended from the limbs of the material body to all who are one with Christ, so has ‘*brother*’ been expanded by Christianity into the designation of all who are children of our Father which is in heaven. Neither ἀδελφός nor ‘*frater*’ had such a meaning till they received it from Christianity; the idea of such close relationship between comparative strangers being unknown to the heathen. ‘*Frater*’ is still in use, in somewhat modified forms, in its original signification of brother, and it is also employed to designate the members of the different Romanist mendicant orders. And the Teutonic word for ‘*frater*,’ (our ‘*brother*,’ the German ‘*bruder*’) has also not lost its original signification. A brother is, as he ever was, the nearest of kin, after their common parents, to his father’s sons. But we are bidden *as a community*, to “love as brethren,” to feel our mutual connexion to be as intimate as a brother’s. The reason why ‘*fraternity*’ is not so strong a term as ‘*brotherhood*’ is, perhaps, and indeed very probably, the following. Mendicants were, as has been said, called ‘*fratres*,’ or ‘*friars*,’ or,

(as the word was once spelled) 'freres.' An established body of them was a 'fraternitas.' And hence all bodies of men, more or less *officially* connected together, sometimes are called by that name; although it is needless to say that the sense in which the word is used is not a very good one.

Thus have we sought out in our languages, by observing the scars which remain unto this day, and will probably remain unto the end of days, what those wounds were which Christianity healed: and how she more than healed the divisions of her people: how she bound them more closely together than ever they could have held together without her—uniting individual families as members of one body, and the different kindreds of the nation as one family: and also, how, when Christianity was no more than a name, the "virtue that went out of her" was no more than a name, "healing the hurt of the daughter of her people slightly, and crying, Peace, peace, when there was no peace."

(3) *The Virtues ennobled.*

We would proceed to inquire in the next place, whether there are indications in the languages of the means by which such a happy state of things was brought about. In other words, what moral changes Christianity wrought in the personal virtues; and how language was modified by reason of those changes.

To begin with the word 'virtue' itself, no proof is necessary to shew that the beau ideal of a virtuous man in the days when the Prince of war reigned, and the Prince of peace had not expelled him, was what Sir Toby Belch called "a bloody opposite." The more skulls a man could produce out of which he had knocked the life, the greater title he had to be esteemed virtuous.

It is not to be supposed that the estimation of 'tugend' was any higher among the Teutons in the days of Thor and Woden. One could think that if Woden could look on 'tugend' since its transformation, his countenance would fall. The meed of virtue is not now withheld from the most timorous, as such; and a woman can be virtuous without being a virago. It seems worthy of remark, however, that in Italy the *summum bonum* is placed in artistic accomplishment, a person skilled in them being a 'virtuoso;' while the French 'vertù' is not much more highly exalted than 'virtus' of old.

A still more interesting word than 'virtue' is *humility*; a term raised from the very ground, so to speak, and made to sit among the cardinal virtues by the single force of Christianity.

'Humilitas' is, indeed, a classical word, and was used by the authors of the golden age. But a tinge of meanness coloured all its significations. There was nothing of 'noble' in humilis. And the same must be said of the A. S. *nyderung*, previous to its adoption by Christianity, the import of which may be expressed by *lowness*, as distinguished from *lowliness*.

To be a humble person was to be not only a person "of no reputation," but one who had done nothing to merit one. But from the time that Christ appeared, and "*made Himself* of no reputation," it has been otherwise with "all them that love His appearing."

Charity has been much ennobled by Christianity. *χάρις*, *χάριτος*, originally meant a favour either given or received. But it was one of the precepts which Christ taught and practised, that "it is more blessed to give than to receive." And so 'charity' lost its meaning of a favour received, retaining only that of a favour given.

The word charity, in the signification of 'love,' is from the Latin 'caritas.' And this, too, has been ennobled. Cicero has stated what must be considered to be his idea of the climax of 'caritas'—

"Omnes omnium caritates patria una complexa est."

But St Paul thus describes the obligations of charity: "Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things." Of a truth, after having thus comprehended every virtue in 'charity,' St Paul has well said, "charity never faileth."

These two passages have been contrasted to shew how much Christianity has brought out and ennobled 'charity,' above what certainly must be considered the most comprehensive estimate that can be formed of it without the teaching of our holy religion.

Side by side with this mention of 'charity,' in which we have observed that it has become nothing less than the love of God with all the heart, and of one's neighbour as one's self, it may be remarked that 'dear,' akin as it is to the verb 'to dare,' once had not only its present meaning, but also a very different one—

"Would I had met my *dearest* foe in heaven,
Ere I had seen that day."—*Hamlet*.

Johnson and Malone prefer "*direst*," as a more accurate reading than "dearest." But Horne Tooke has proved them mistaken, shewing that the word came from 'to dere'—hurt, do mischief—a word now extinct. And the meaning of 'dear,' just alluded to, is extinct also.

How much confusion has been caused in the acceptation of the two last considered words by reason of a false apprehension of that cameleon word, honour! How many swords have been dipped in the blood of friends, that 'honour' might be preserved without a stain! And this deadly delusion, which actually sprung up under the very wing of Christianity—surely itself only a delusion—it has cost our religion much ado to prevail against.

Yet so it is, that at last this word is beginning to be somewhat established in its right of relationship to 'upright:' every upright man is honourable, and no one is esteemed honourable who is not at the same time upright.

And now, it may be asked, does it not appear from this very imperfect sketch of what once was the general disposition of men, that the received notions of right and wrong, and of the obligations due between man and man, were at best ill defined, and worse understood; nay, that they were radically wrong in themselves? And that, in the confusion necessarily consequent upon such a state of things, men not unfrequently "called evil good, and good evil, put darkness for light, and light for darkness, put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter?"

(4) *Exceptions.*

Although the great majority have lowered their tone, if not their feeling, in deference to Christianity, concealing, as best they can, the evil that lurks within, and fearing to give expression to it in words, yet so it is, that sooner or later, "the fire kindles," and "at last they speak with their tongue," unable to refrain any longer.

And so we must expect to meet with words which either have wholly escaped the influence of Christianity, or have even grown into meanings inconsistent with its doctrine under its very wing.

And it seems incumbent on us not to pass over such words wholly in silence, inasmuch as, if they prove nothing else, they shew us that there are limits beyond which the influence which we are seeking to trace has not yet advanced.

In other words, since there yet remain vast numbers of persons, whose sentiments are in a greater or less degree at variance with the doctrines of Christianity, *we must be prepared to meet with words, in the languages of Christian nations, which have either been only lighted up in part by their religion, and have a dark side as well as an illuminated one, or which have only been so much shone upon as to make their darkness the more visible.*

And all that can be said of such words, in connexion with Christianity, is, "If the light which is in them be darkness, how great is that darkness!" To take one or two instances of such words: 'fellow' is a term which was thought worthy to be so highly exalted above its ordinary application, as to be used to express the close union between the first two Persons of the Trinity—"Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my *fellow*, saith the Lord of hosts¹."

Nevertheless, it has also another signification which exhibits a great falling off both from its dignity and its worth. It was used by the same translators who rendered the above passage, to convey an idea of reproach: "This *fellow* doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils²."

Now, we must needs conclude, from the existence of

¹ Zech. xiii. 7.

² Matt. xii. 24.

this meaning, that there are persons among ourselves who are viewed to the greatest advantage at a distance; persons who, after having been admitted to intercourse so close as that which their religion not only allows, but enjoins, have proved themselves unworthy of it; inso-much that, by a mere refinement of irony, they have a term of endearment applied to them which they have ceased to deserve, and because they have ceased to deserve it. Again, there is something very humiliating in the thought that the nation should have suffered '*resentment*' to fall from the kindly sense in which good Dr. Barrow used it, who spoke of the "good man as a faithful *resenter* and requiter of benefits." It now lives among us only in a signification which undoes the Scriptural injunction, "forgive, if ye have ought against any."

A like unforgiving spirit animates retaliation, which is nothing more than a *requital* of '*talis*.' We shall give one more example, and we have done.

Lust, now of too polluted a signification to be even discussed, meant originally simply *pleasure, desire*. Among the Germans it has that signification still.

So long as such words as these just mentioned remain among us in their unworthy significations, it will not be denied that Christianity has, as yet, left much undone.

At the same time it must not be forgotten that it has also done much, having kindled so great an illumination with so small a spark, having "created a soul beneath the ribs of death," and made that soul to speak things new and unheard before.

CHAPTER IV.

CHRIST AND HIS DOCTRINES.

(1) *The Names of Christ.*

WE come now to the source and fountain-head whence all that influence flows, which we are endeavouring to trace, to Christ and His doctrines.

To begin with the names by which the Founder of our religion is known to His followers. What testimony is there to that which He hath wrought, so great, and it may be added so undesigned, as that which is afforded by the names whereby He is known among men! And what words have been so ennobled as those!

If we consider almost all the names by which Christ is called, *apart from the considerations which they now carry along with them*, there is nothing in them of strikingly superior excellence to that of other words.

Thus, the name *Jesus*, at which "every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth," before it was the name of Jesus, was certainly held in no greater estimation than the name Moses. Joshua the son of Nun, and Joshua the son of Josedech, the high priest, and Jesus surnamed Justus, who were each known by this name, were only men. Still less can be said of *Χριστός*, used as it had been by Æschylus in conjunction with *φάρμακον*¹, to signify the unguents of an apothecary.

Nor did the appellation whereby He was pleased to speak of Himself—*Son of Man*—although it implies so much, contain in itself anything distinguishing. And the principal significance of '*God-Man*' is the coming of the Son of God in the "likeness of *sinful flesh*."

¹ Æsch. *Prom. Vinc.* v. 489.

As for our rendering of the word Jesus, viz. 'Saviour,' it is a modernised form of 'Salvator,' which Augustine coined for the purpose; the word never having existed before. "Christus *Jesus*," says Augustine, "id est, Christus *Salvator*: hoc est enim Latine Jesus. Nec quærant grammatici quam sit Latinum, sed Christiani quam verum. Salus enim Latinum nomen est; 'Salvare' et 'Salvator' non fuerunt hæc Latina antequam veniret Salvator, et hæc Latina fecit¹."

But, excepting the fact that this word, 'Saviour,' 'Salvator,' was never used to designate any one before it was applied to Christ, there is nothing striking therein: there is nothing in its import sufficiently adequate to express fully what He hath wrought for us.

If we turn from the Latin language, and those derived from it, to the Teutonic, we shall find the same observation fully borne out. For the Teutons, who generally prefer giving expression to their thoughts in their own language, before borrowing words from the stranger for that purpose, have set apart a very significant, but, at the same time, a very commonplace term to express the idea conveyed by 'salvator.' It is Heiland, the A. S. Hælend, *i.e.* the Healer.

But can we be surprised at the unworthiness of these appellations? It was as improbable, that when Christ came into the world, He would find that man understood His Office, and recognised His Person, as that there should have been found in the language of men any adequate term to express either the one or the other. And so He was as content to take upon Him our names, as He was willing to take upon Himself our nature, thereby exalting both the one and the other to the very throne and dignity of God.

¹ From Mr Trench's work, *On the Study of Words*.

(2) *The Doctrines of Christ.*

If we turn from Christ to His doctrines, we shall not find that they were more adequately recognised in language than the Lord, in whose train they followed.

Thus, the great act whereby Christ sets man free from the "bondage of sin and death," that he should "no longer serve sin,"—is expressed by a word, which signified the releasing by purchase of one man from the thralldom of another—'*redemption*.'

Side by side with '*redemption*,' we may notice '*atonement*,' which, being dismembered, is at-one-ment. From the singularly happy way in which this word expresses what is intended by it, it might almost be supposed that it was framed and put together for the express purpose of manifesting forth the reconciliation effected by Christ between His Father and His followers. But it would seem that it was the term in ordinary use to express reconciliation between man and man; and that too, not always in very dignified senses.

"He shewed himself unto them as they strove, and would have set them *at one* again." (Acts vii. 36.)

"I am of the church, and will be glad to do my benevolences to make *atonements* and compromises between you."—*Merry Wives of Windsor*, I. i.

Again, what a cold and spiritless term is '*fides*,' ranging, in its original sense, only between the limits of birth and death in the length thereof, and from one man to another in the breadth thereof! And how excellent a thing has it not come forth from the hands of Christianity, the link of union between the things which are seen, and the things which are not seen; the bond betwixt God and man; the very thews and sinews which hold together the mystical body of Christ!

¹ Our *faith*, the French *foi*, and the Italian *fè*.

Much more significant in its original import is the A. S. word *belief*¹, a word which deserves rather to be placed above '*faith*,' than to have fallen somewhat out of its religious signification. For the ancient sense of the word is nothing more than is now expressed by '*live*,' which is a remnant of it. The way in which it came to receive its present meaning, may be seen from the following passage from *Robert of Gloucester* :

"The pope hereof was glad, and twei holi men hym sende,
Fagan and Dimiam, hys soul for to amende,
That rygt *bi leue* hym tagte, and gef hym Christendom."

Thus '*belief*' has a prior claim to the meaning which now is more especially attached to '*faith*,' and contains in its original acceptation, coupled with its derived one, that fundamental doctrine, "The just shall *live* by faith."

Still, there is nothing in the word itself, irrespective of its appropriation by Christianity, that in any way points to *life after death*; to say nothing of the ignorance and conflicting opinions which prevailed without Christianity respecting the proper rule of life.

Another word, which also goes to bear out the inadequacy of the terms used to express the Christian doctrines is *truth*. For it is a contraction of *troweth*, from the verb *to trow*. The following description of it by Horne Tooke, can only refer to it as uninfluenced by Christianity.

"That every man in his communication with others should speak that which he *troweth*, is of so great importance to mankind, that it ought not to surprise us if we find the most extravagantly exaggerated praises bestowed upon *Truth*. But *truth* supposes mankind, *for whom* and *by whom* alone the word is formed,

¹ The same word as the German *glauben*, contracted for *gelauben*; the Dutch is *be-looven*, *ghe-looven*; the A. S. *lyfan*, *ge-lyfan*, the Gothic *lanb-jan*, *ge-lanbjan*.

and *in whom* alone it is applicable. If no man, no truth. There is, therefore, no such thing as eternal, immutable, everlasting *truth*, unless mankind, *such as they are at present*, be also eternal, immutable, and everlasting. Two persons may contradict each other, and yet both speak *truth*; for the *truth* of one person may be opposed to the *truth* of another. To speak *truth* may be a vice as well as a virtue; for there are many occasions where it ought not to be spoken."

Now, Horne Tooke has manifestly overlooked the great change which this word has undergone. For, it may be asked, what did Christ come with, if it was not *The truth*? He calls himself *The truth*. Is not He eternal, immutable, everlasting? The fact is, that without Christ, truth is even what Tooke has described it to be; just as without Him man is a condemned sinner: it is the mere conviction of a fallible man. But *the truth* is the conviction of fallible men set right by Christianity.

CHAPTER V.

THE CHURCH AND HER ORDINANCES.

THE visible Church of Christ was, during the first three centuries, one undivided whole, both in its doctrine and its discipline.

And the language in which the revelation respecting Jesus Christ was made known by the first teachers thereof, was, for the most part, necessarily Greek. For that was the language most generally spoken.

For, although Parthians, Cretes, and Arabians, heard, each in his own tongue, the wonderful works of God miraculously declared, still this will not be taken as an evidence that they were altogether ignorant of Greek, if it be remembered how widely Greek civilisation had made itself felt, and, consequently, the Greek language had been introduced since the subjugation of Asia and part of Africa by Alexander, and the subsequent partition of his vast dominions, and the consolidation of the several parts into kingdoms ruled over by Greeks; insomuch, that it need be no matter of surprise, that the distant people of Pontus were not ignorant of Greek, the language of their conquerors, although they still spoke in their own. The effect, indeed, of Greek influence may be supposed to be somewhat similar to that of the Norman conquest on England.

Hence, the Jews of Palestine knew Greek; the Jews in other countries spoke little else. It had so much become their own language, that the Old Testament was rendered into Greek for their convenience. Moreover, a foreign¹ Jew did not, as at the present day, have the

¹ i. e. one living out of Palestine.

name of the people, among whom he sojourned, added to his own national designation¹, but was simply called a Hellenistic Jew.

Hence, too, the earliest Christian Fathers wrote in Greek; not to mention that this was probably the reason why the New Testament itself was written in that language.

But it was not long before the Latin language also became of great importance to the teachers of Christianity. In many of the Roman provinces it was very generally, and in some almost universally spoken. In some cases it almost entirely superseded the ancient language, as was the case in Spain and Gaul². Men living in countries at a great distance from Rome wrote in that language for the instruction of their own immediate neighbours. Doctrines were discussed, heretics were confuted, by Christians of different nations, in Latin.

Hence it came to pass, that in the churches of the West, where Latin was most prevalent, many of the ecclesiastical and theological terms were Latin, although a great number were still Greek, while, in some instances³, Greek and Latin terms existed together. If the Eastern or Greek churches did not make use of Latin terms, it was because they had no occasion for them. Greek was the language in which they had been taught Christianity, and in which they still communicated their thoughts; and so any influx of Latin terms

¹ *e. g.* a Spanish, Portuguese, English Jew.

² The only written language until within a very late period, in Hungary, was the Latin, in which all their laws and public processes were promulgated: and it is still the most common medium of communication. Hungary has a national language, but it is not generally spoken, and is even supposed to be not understood by more than one-third of the inhabitants.

³ *e. g.* minister and clericus.

must have been slow at the best; and therefore no argument can be drawn from any apparent lack of Latin terms in the Greek vocabularies, to shew that there was a want of unity between the Eastern and Western churches. At the same time, there is direct evidence of the unity which prevailed, in the fact, that the Greek terms in use among the Christians of the Western churches are the very same as those which were used by their Eastern brethren.

But it was only so long as the Church "kept whole and undefiled the faith that was once delivered to the saints," that her unity remained whole and undefiled. Undoubtedly, persecution had contributed much to this unity, by rivetting her attention to the "one thing needful." So long as Christians had "minded the same thing," they had naturally held together, although independent to think and act for themselves in all things that appertained to their everlasting salvation. But when the Church began to err, she began to split. Finally, she broke asunder in two parts. The Eastern churches fell into picture-worship, the Western into image-worship. And when the cloud of dust which followed this mighty rupture had been somewhat laid, there might be seen two horrent misshapen masses, each in a high state of fusion. Of old, each church had been distinct, although all had been linked together in close union. But the effect of error was first to divide what had been united, and then to fuse what had been distinct, thus working confusion out of order.

It was not to be expected that much animation could remain after such convulsions. Indeed, as the Church, or the churches (for, after the rupture, there were two) had fallen, so they in a great measure remained. The action that did go on within was principally an organic one.

It might not be without interest to trace the influence of the different changes thus wrought, in the body corporate of the Western church (for with that is our principal concern), on the language of modern Europe. But the task would be an arduous one; inasmuch as, the organic changes being frequent, the corresponding changes which would have to be marked in the languages must necessarily be many in number. Indeed, even within the last year our language has been enriched by means of such a formation as those we speak of, with an entirely new word—*immaculate-conception-medal*; this being a charm intended to be worn by Roman Catholic soldiers in the East.

But, irrespective of the difficulty of the task which such an undertaking would impose, we are the rather induced only partially to concern ourselves with it, inasmuch as it may be gravely questioned, whether, after all, Christianity, properly so called, will be found to have been the cause of these transformations.

To return to the point under consideration. Notwithstanding the changes which had been effected in realities—in doctrine, and even in discipline—the original terms, both ecclesiastical and theological were, so far as the case admitted, scrupulously preserved. The fact is, the more men lose of a reality, the more tenaciously they cling to its name. Samson was still called Samson when his hair was shorn, his strength had departed from him, his eyes had been put out, and he was grinding at the mill. The Church was still called the Church, when she had trodden under foot the Word of God, which was to have been “a light unto her feet, and a lamp to her path,” when the glory had departed from her, and she was groping in the dark amidst “the potsherds of the earth.” It was this feeling which occasioned the nervous industry with which Europe was

assured, even at the time when three popes excluded each other, and each other's adherents, from the pale of 'the one indivisible Church,' that 'yet there were not three infallibles, but one infallible.'

And to this circumstance we owe the preservation to us of those terms, which had been, as it were, consecrated by men who counted not their lives so dear to them as their Redeemer—to say nothing of the actual forms in which they sung His praise and sought His mediation; for with these we are not at present concerned.

It will be our endeavour, in the ensuing investigation, to make good the following assertion:

Although it is a leading policy of the Italian church to enjoin belief on her members of what she teaches, because she teaches it, *yet there existed men, and those not a few, (at least in this country and in Germany) from the very first, who, however submissively they conformed to the discipline, yet did not receive without a thought the doctrines which were delivered to them. That the spirit of inquiry which broke out at the time of the Reformation, had never been more than checked at the worst.*

It will be easiest to trace this in our own language and in German, both because they are—the first in a great measure, and the latter altogether—different from the language in which the Latin church taught and prayed, and because we very much doubt whether any such spirit ever existed in most of the other countries, to a sufficient extent to influence their languages in any very perceptible degree.

The way in which we shall endeavour to prove one part of the above assertion, viz.

That the members of the unreformed church have, in all the countries of Europe, submitted without much

inquiry to the discipline imposed upon them—will be to shew that the terms belonging thereunto were received into the languages *as they were, untranslated*. They had not been turned over in the minds of those who accepted them (and men usually think in the tongue in which they were born), and so were received as they were given, and preserved as they were received.

The most ancient word in use among Christians to designate the body of Christ's followers, and the building in which they worshipped, is *ἐκκλησία*.

Our Lord himself used it in the former sense in Matt. xvi. 18,¹ and St Paul in the latter sense in 1 Cor. xi. 18.² This became the principal word in use in the Latin church. Tertullian uses it: "una nobis et illis fides, unus Deus, idem Christus, eadem spes, eadem lavacri Sacramenta. Semel dixerim, una ecclesia." (*De Virginibus Velandis*, c. 2.)

Accordingly, we find it used in the languages of those nations which embraced Christianity through the teaching of the Latin church. It was the term in use among the ancient British; we meet with it in the name of an early settlement '*Ægeles burh*,' A. S. for Aylesbury³; while, in the ancient British, or Welsh, it is 'eglwys.' Both these, the A. S. and the Welsh, are evidently modifications of 'ecclesia.' In French it is *église*, &c.

Κυριακή is as ancient a word as *ἐκκλησία*. St Paul uses *κυριακόν* in the signification of the *Lord's* supper⁴, and St John uses *κυριακή*⁵ to signify the *Lord's* day. But these are the only two passages in which the word is found in the New Testament. So that in its meaning

¹ "ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν."

² "συνερχομένων ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ."

³ Dr Guest's work, *On the Early-English Settlements in Britain*.

⁴ 1 Cor. xi. 20.

⁵ Rev. i. 10.

of church it was less ancient than *ἐκκλησία*. Mr Trench¹ accounts for its presence in the Teutonic languages in the following manner: While the Anglo-Saxons, and other tribes of the Teutonic stock, were almost universally converted through contact with the Latin church, in the western provinces of the empire, or by its missionaries, yet, before this, some of the Goths of the Lower Danube had been brought to Christianity by Greek missionaries from Constantinople; and this word *κυριακή* did, with certain others, pass from the Greek to the Gothic tongue; and these Goths, the first converted to Christianity, and therefore the first that had a Christian vocabulary, lent the word in their turn to the other German tribes, and, among others, to our Saxon forefathers, who retained it among them in the form 'kyrik' or 'kyrch.' The Scotch have 'kirk,' and the Germans 'kirche.'

But this does not account for the absence of *ἐκκλησία* from the German language, which was as much in use among the eastern Christians as *κυριακή*. If we might venture an opinion on so difficult a subject, we should suggest that *κυριακή* was more likely to be adopted by the Teutons, as being more suited to the language than *ἐκκλησία*. Churches, *i. e.* buildings, were also called *conventicula*², a term which we have given to dissenting places of meeting, and which has most undeservedly been rejected by them, and thought scorn of by ourselves. The Romanists retain it in 'convent'³.

¹ *Study of Words*.—Bishop Beveridge held the same opinions as here expressed.

² Bingham.

³ From this sense comes our *Covent-garden*, for *convent-garden*. It is equally singular that dissenting communities prefer the term *chapel*, meaning, as it originally did (according to Spelman), "a chest or repository in which the reliques of the martyrs were preserved: then, any building in which these *capellæ* of reliques were laid."

Καθολικός occurs nowhere in the New Testament¹, but it has been written, by a later hand, at the head of some of the epistles, hence called ‘Catholic,’ or general. Theodoret, explaining what is meant by ‘Catholic’ epistles, says that they were addressed “Κάθολον τοῖς Πιστοῖς:” and Pacian² shews some feeling of attachment for the term; he says, “Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus cognomen; illud me nuncupat, hoc me ostendit”—‘the one is my title, the other is my distinction.’ When we remember that this distinction only came to be considered necessary after the multiplication of heresies, each of which claimed the title of ‘Christian,’ it will be seen that this word resulted not so much from the influence of Christianity, as from the want of it. And so we shall give it no further consideration than to say, that its use is as general as its name implies.

As might have been expected, from the use of the word ἐκκλησία, the term *ecclesiastic* was, in the early ages, applied to all members of the *ecclesia*, to all Christians without distinction. Eusebius uses the word in this sense, “πλείστων οὖν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀνδρῶν κατ’ ἐκείνου καιροῦ τῆς ἀληθείας ὑπεραγωνιζομένων³.” Cyril, Origen, Epiphanius, and others, use it in the same sense.

And it was also to be supposed, from the arrogance of the Romish hierarchy, who refuse to the laity the position which they once had in the Church, that they would bring it about that this word should be applied wholly to themselves.

To turn from the general body of Christians to their instructors, *episcopus* was in use before Christianity took it to itself. The officers sent by the Athenians to inspect their subject states, and to see that everything

¹ It first appears in Ignatius *ad Smyrn.*

² *Epist. ad Sempronianum.*

³ Lib. iv. c. 7.

was well ordered there, were called *ἐπίσκοποι*. And the Romans gave the same title to their inspectors of bread and provisions. Thus Cicero had a bishopric, being, as he himself says, “*episcopus oræ et Campaniæ*.”

Of *πρεσβύτερος*¹ it is needless to say more, than that it was an ecclesiastical term from the beginning. It has been received in more or less slightly modified forms as universally as *episcopus*. The German form of it is ‘priester,’ and the French, ‘prêtre:’ in English it is less preserved in ‘priest;’ but the older form ‘prester’ (‘prester-John’) bears more unmistakeable marks of its derivation.

*Διάκονος*² may, like the last-considered word, be traced back to the days of the Apostles, and has been as widely received.

A somewhat singular word, both in its probable origin and in some of its ultimate applications, is *clericus*.—It is generally supposed, from the fact of its being derived from *κλήρος*³, that this name was given to those who were set apart for the sacred office of the ministry, from the circumstance of the Apostles having cast lots in order to decide the election of one who was to be numbered among them. Still, it does not seem that this mode of choice, if choice it might be called, was very commonly resorted to, if, indeed, it ever was. A more probable derivation, perhaps, is from *κλήρος* in the sense of *κληρονομία*, a word which was applied to all Christians without distinction.

This word has come to be applied to lay persons, holding offices wholly unconnected with sacred things. The origin of this usage is accounted for by Blackstone,

¹ The A. S. form was ‘preostre,’ the Spanish ‘presbytero.’

² Dutch ‘diaker,’ Germ. ‘diacon,’ It. and Span. ‘diacono.’

³ Indeed the word itself is still preserved in our University, in the phrase *Concio ad clerum*.

who observes, "That judges were usually created out of the sacred order, and all the inferior offices were supplied by the lower *clergy*, which has occasioned their successors to be denominated clerks to this day¹." From the application of this word to persons employed about courts of law, to its present general usage, the transition is easy.

Another word, now only applied to the clergy of cathedral churches, but once of a much wider application, is *canonicus*, from *κανών*. This word, which, when applied (as it still is) to "those books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church," means 'rule of faith,'—had also a different meaning. It signified, among other things, the roll or catalogue of every church, wherein the names of all the ecclesiastics were written; which was, as it were, the rule of knowing to what church they belonged². Hence, according to Basil, all clergy were sometimes called *canonici*; as were also all others whose names were set down in the church's books, to entitle them to receive maintenance from the church; *e.g.* monks, virgins, widows, &c. Another term once applied to the clergy in this country, but now almost obsolete, is *parson*. Our object in mentioning it in this place is, to point out the signification of the word itself, and to shew how generally the word from which it is derived is in use. It is from the same root as *parish*, *παρoικία*, the adjectival form of which (parochial) exhibits its derivation more clearly³.

All these terms that we have cited were received by the nations of Europe *untranslated*.

¹ Comm. i. 17.

² Bingham, i. cap. 5, § 10.

³ According to Skinner, 'parson, *q. d.* parishon.' The barbarous Latin is *parochianus*. The Low Latin, however, is *persona*, whence *impersonare*, to institute a rector.—See RICHARDSON.

If we turn from persons to things, we shall find the same observation borne out.

Surplice was received with as little question as any of the foregoing words. For it is a contraction¹ of ‘superpelliceum,’ or, ‘superplicium²,’ the meaning of the word being “the garment which covered the cassock, or rough coat, or pellise.” ‘Chancel,’ the Latin *cancelli*, has been similarly preserved. The German for ‘pulpit’ is *Kanzel*.

The same may be said of ‘litany,’ ‘liturgy,’ and many other terms which belong indeed to the machinery, if one might so speak, of their religion, but do not intimately concern the persons of the worshippers.

Now, however much the hand of the clergy may have been in the preservation of these terms—as it undoubtedly was—yet the adoption of the words which fell from the lips of their teachers by the people, was assuredly a voluntary act. And the fact, that so many terms of this degree of importance to themselves have been received by so many different nations *as they were given*, and preserved as they were received, *in their native form*, appears to us to afford accumulative evidence of the fact which we have been endeavouring to establish, viz.—*That the Christians of the middle ages conformed submissively to the discipline of the church to which they belonged.*

We shall now endeavour to shew that *There nevertheless existed men, and those not a few, both in this country and in Germany, from the very first, who did not receive the doctrines which were taught them, without inquiry whether ‘these things were so.’* And we shall consider it sufficient evidence that they were

¹ Wheatly *On the Common Prayer*.—It is the Spanish *sobrepellise*, and French *surplis*.

² Richardson.

turned over in the mind, if we find that they were expressed in the language of those who embraced them; and that, because *men think in the tongue in which they were born*.

Now, inasmuch as our forefathers had the truths of Christianity set before them in a great measure in words of other tongues, (this has been seen to be the case with the disciplinal terms,) the expression of them in their own language must have been, at least to a certain extent, their own doing.

Thus, for example, our ancestors had a book put into their hands, and were told that it *was* the *Bible*, the *Scripture*, the *Testament*, Old and New; and they joyfully read it, became acquainted with its contents, and called it *Holy*; exclaiming in the gladness of their hearts that it was none other to them than the *Gospel*. Again, they were taught to use *litany*, *liturgy*, *missal*, and they did so with a ready mind, not forgetting the names of these things which they were taught. At the same time, for the exercise of prayer itself they had a name of their own, 'bæd,' the A. S. for prayer¹, a word which came later to be applied to the toys which the Romanists finger at their devotions.

It may be remarked, that the word 'Gospel' was anciently in use among the Germans, but has become obsolete; they have, however, a term of their own whereby to designate the Bible, *Heilige Schrift*, the exact equivalent of *Holy Writ*, while the German words *beten*, *gebet*, *to pray*, *prayer*, will be recognised as identical with 'bæd,' and 'bid,' which they have outlived, being in use at the present day.

For other instances of the same kind, we may refer to Chapter IV. where we saw, that if our forefathers

¹ 'Bidding the beads' is therefore praying the prayers; this word is still retained in the expression 'bidding prayer.'

accepted the *faith*, it was not till they could give it their *belief*; and if they received Jesus as the *Saviour*, it was not till they could realise Him as their *Hælend*; if they gave credence to the *doctrines* which were declared to them, it was not till they felt them to be *the truth*. And we saw that the Germans have corresponding terms; that Jesus is their *Heiland*, that their belief is *glauben*; and we might have added that 'righteousness' with us is what *gerechtigkeit* is with them.

If it be doubted whether thoughtful reflection was at the bottom of these translations, let the number of different titles which were given to Jesus by the earliest Christians be called to mind, 'Mediator', 'Saviour,' &c., although the angel only commanded that "His name should be called Jesus." From whence, then, comes so great a variety? Comes it not from the variety of aspects in which Christ was viewed, and contemplated? And, it may be added, '*Jesus*' was a *Hebrew* name; but the earliest Christians spoke, and therefore thought, in Greek; hence the Greek names *μεσσιτης*, &c. After them arose Christians who spoke only in Latin; hence 'Salvator' and other Latin names of Christ.

It is not without some diffidence that we have brought forward this argument, which has occurred to ourselves, and which we have nowhere met with: still we have ventured to do so, partly from its apparent feasibility, and partly from the fact that, even if (which we cannot persuade ourselves to be the case) it establishes nothing, yet the influence of Christianity on modern language has been exhibited in the instances adduced.

¹ It might be well to remark, that 'right' is the selfsame word both in the Teutonic and the Latin languages, as may be seen from the following comparison of some of the different forms of it:—Germ. recht, Swed. rätt, Icel. rettr, French (d)roit, It. (d)ritto, Span. (de)recho.

But, if it does establish anything, if there be anything to be learnt from words made by the people, or at least applied to new uses by them, it cannot be less than this: *That the people had first made the ideas their own, before giving expression to them in their own words.*

And this spirit of inquiry, so manifested, although it might have been checked after the reception of Christianity, did not entirely die out, and require rekindling from another source. For Wiclif, in translating the Bible, not for the use of 'lered men', but for "unlettrid and lewide," found to a great extent the same terms in use which had been appropriated to Christianity at its first introduction. The fact that the word 'Gospellers' was applied as a term of opprobrium to those who took part in the revival of religious inquiry, is not without significance.

Similarly we cannot fail to find other corroborations of historical events, by tracing out the effect which those events had on our languages.

Thus, for example, we know from history that Christianity was first taught in towns, and that it was first received in towns. The rural districts held fast their idolatry long after the towns had cast it off. Now, if we had not known this fact from history, we might have learnt it from the languages. For the word 'pagan' came to signify 'idolater' after Christianity had become in a great measure established in cities. Properly speaking, the word meant no more than a villager, a dweller in a *pagus*. Hence came the French 'payen,' the Italian and Spanish 'pagano.'

"Whereas, therefore, religion did first take place in cities, and in that respect was a cause why the name of Pagans, which properly signified a country people,

came to be used in common speech for the same that infidels and unbelievers were¹."

And the Teutonic languages add their independent testimony to this fact. The Gothic *Haithnai*, A. S. *Hæthne*, Dutch *Hedninge*, German *Heiden*, our *heathen*, are witnesses that the inhabitants of the *heaths* maintained their rites at a time when their neighbours of the towns had cast their idols to the moles and the bats.

To take another historical fact, that of persecution. Had history been silent on the subject, we might still have learnt that there had been persecution, from the languages. What else could have preserved in its present meaning the word *martyr*? And to what else do we owe the origin of the word 'tribulation?' *Tribulum*² was a threshing instrument or roller, whereby the Roman husbandman separated the grain from the husks, and *tribulatio* primarily signified that sifting process. But some of the fathers appropriated it to the signification of that other sifting process to which John the Baptist refers, when he says, "whose fan is in His hand, and He will thoroughly purge His floor³."

In like manner we shall find, that when the Reformation shook society to its very centre, exposing to the light of heaven priceless treasures which had been sepulchred for centuries beneath foul corruptions, which, in their turn, were ill concealed behind the blaze of tinsel and the smoke of incense,—that all this was not effected without some changes in language. We purpose searching for some indications of these changes in a separate chapter.

¹ Hooker, *Ecol. Pol.* v. 80.

² Trench *On the Study of Words*.

³ To persecution, too, we owe the origin of *traitor*, which is a contraction of *traditor*, meaning those who gave up their Bibles or other sacred things to their persecutors, when bidden to do so.

CHAPTER VI.

CHANGES INTRODUCED BY THE REFORMATION.

IF there is one event more than another (next to the introduction of Christianity) which made itself felt in the lands in which it took place, it is the Reformation. No institutions, however secular, were uninfluenced by it. From the sceptre to the shepherd's staff, society was shaken, the joints and bands which held it together were loosened, only to be more firmly made fast. When the scales first fell from the eyes of the nation, which had been blinded by superstition, it saw men as trees walking. The sudden glare of the light was too much for it, till it could look around collectedly and with composure. Men no sooner saw that the altars on which they had offered incense were altars of Baal, than their first thought was to throw them down, without much concern as to the means employed.

And so it is no marvel if they sometimes trampled on holy ground with their feet shod, not knowing that "God was in that place." Nor were they at much pains to hide the unseemliness of the lumber which they carried away, that the land might be no more polluted with it. On the contrary, they studiously held it up to ridicule.

It will be our endeavour to prove from our language that such was the case.

The cloke which had been used to cover the corruptions of the unreformed Church, and used till it had fallen in holes, and exposed to view that which it should

have hidden, was antiquity. This, then, was the first to have violent hands laid on it. Accordingly, they made sport with 'antique' till there was no more left of it than *antic*¹. Shakspeare uses it in its transformed state—

"This wild disguise hath almost
Antick'd us all."—*Ant. and Cleop.* III. 7.

But this merry-making was not always so innocent. The hands that pulled down were sometimes profane ones. This may be seen in *black saunt*², which was a kind of burlesque or hymn, performed with all kinds of discordant and strange noises, in ridicule of the Ter-sanctus of the missal—"Holy, holy, holy"—

"Let's sing a black santis, then let's howl
In our own beastly voices."

BEAUMONT AND FLETCHER, *Mad Lover*.

And, in like manner, *to bless*, came to signify 'to wave or brandish;' Dr Johnson being of opinion that this sense was derived from the action sometimes used in benediction—

"And burning blades about their heades doe blesse."

SPENSER'S *Faerie Queene*.

A similar spirit discovered 'hocus pocus' in 'hoc est corpus.' In other words, when men discovered that

¹ What we are endeavouring to point out may be illustrated by the following passage from Dean Swift's *Tale of a Tub*: "I ought in method to have informed the reader about fifty pages ago, of a fancy Lord Peter took and infused into his brothers, to wear on their coats whatever trimmings came up in fashion, never pulling off any as they went out of the mode, but keeping all together, which amounted in time to a medley the most *antick* you can possibly conceive."

'Tinsel' may be classed with 'antic.' It properly means only something glistening. It obtained its bad sense through the same influence as that which humbled 'antique.' The French is *étincelle*.

² Nares.

the words pronounced by the priest over the elements wrought no change in them, they were at no pains to conceal their contempt for the cheat,—nay, they took the very words out of his mouth the more effectually to express it.

There was a term of opprobrium applied to thieves, which has been thought to have been intended as a sneer at Rome. Its use is well illustrated by the following passage:—*G.* “Sirrah, if they meet not with St Nicolas’s clerks, I’ll give thee this neck.” *C.* “No, I’ll none of it: I prythee keep that for the hangman; for I know thou worshippest St Nicholas as well as any man of falsehood may.”—*I. Henry IV.* II. 1.

It has been thought that this term was so used in allusion to the Romish boy bishops and boy canons. For it appears to have been a Romish custom in some cathedrals to choose a boy bishop on St Nicolas’s day (Dec. 6) from among the choristers, who continued in office till Innocents’ day (Dec. 28), and the rest of the choristers acted as prebends. But a very different person was also called St Nicolas, who has also been called Saunt Satan, in the introduction to the *Black Saunt*. So that it is more probable that this was the saint whose devotees thieves were said to be. Nor does this name seem to have been transferred from the saint to the fiend. For the belief was common among the northern nations that there is an evil spirit named Nicka, Nicken, Nicker; the name is found in the Icelandic, Swedish, Dutch, and our own languages, in this sense. Sir William Temple says that he was a spirit who used to strangle people who fell into the water, according to the belief of the Runic nations. This, then, was the original name for Satan; and the profane jest of making him a saint must have arisen after the Reformation, in ridicule of the popish saint.

It is quite possible that the word *gaudy* exhibits, in the changes which it has undergone, the altered opinion which men entertain of the Romanist festivities. For 'gaudy' was not long since an epithet bestowed on feast-days at the universities. Some time ago it was very generally applied to festivities of any kind—

A foolish utensil of state,
Which, like old plate upon a gaudy day,
Is brought forth to make a show, and that is all."
Goblins, Old Play (NARES).

Now, *gaudy* is evidently from *gaudium*¹. Its use at the universities to denote festal days, implies along with it somewhat of solemnity as well as rejoicing; for all university feast-days may lay claim to be called festival days. Further, since this term is a Latin one, it must either have arisen among, and been principally used by the universities, or the clergy. But it is contrary to analogy that a familiar university term should find its way into the common parlance of men. Such words, for example, as 'battles,' 'commons,' 'keep,' are not known out of our university towns. And consequently it seems necessary to conclude that this term originated with the clergy; and, if so, the use to which it was put is obvious.

Again, *pomp* was the word used of old for religious processions, hence it came to be used for any procession, and, generally, for a train of attendants. It had not lost its good sense in the days of the Commonwealth, although it had acquired a bad one, for Milton has used it to grace a beautiful thought—

“ For on her, as a queen,
A *pomp* of winning graces waited still².”

¹ *Gaudiolum* is *jewel* in sense and etymology.

² Mr Humphry '*On the Common Prayer*.' ³ *Par. Lost*, viii.

If the people thought scorn of what their teachers *did*, it was not probable that they would long continue to reverence what they *said*, in their capacity of leaders of public worship. Hence chanting came to be considered as no better than *cant*, the words which the priest uttered were *gibberish*, and the mode of his uttering them *mummery*.

It is true that some think well to derive *mummery* from *Momus*; but this does not deter us from believing it to be of the kindred of *mumblematins*¹.

‘Cant’ seems to be not only derived from *cantus*, but to be the same word: still some have discovered that there was one John Cant, a ranter, and to him they have traced this word.

‘Gibberish’ is derived by Skinner² from the French *gaber*, to cheat. It is, however, most probably formed from the sound or clatter which is made by rapid speakers, just as ‘shill-I-shall-I’ owes its origin to the fault of hesitation—

“What, methynke ye be clerkyshe,
For ye speak good gibberyshe.”

But it is not to be supposed, from the existence of such words as we have produced, that the nation at large took part in these more violent proceedings. Indeed, had the feeling which gave rise to such expressions been universal, many terms, harmless in themselves, now that their sting has been removed—as, for example, *Shrove-Tuesday*, *Christ-mas*,—would not have been so generally retained as they were.

As it was, the violence of one part of the people produced a slight reaction in the more sober and phleg-

¹ Prof. Blunt’s work on the *Reformation*, in which this last word is made use of.

² Nares.

matic of the Reformers. And in process of time this difference of opinion which arose from it became so perceptible, as to occasion a division among the Protestants; one part of them adhering resolutely to what they believed to be at once harmless and time-honoured, while the other as stoutly cried down everything on which the smell of popery had passed. And the consequence was, as might have been expected, occasional misunderstanding, which did not always end so harmlessly as did Sir Roger de Coverley's adventure¹. .

"This worthy knight," we are told, "being then but a stripling, had occasion to inquire which was the way to St Anne's Lane; upon which, the person whom he spoke to, instead of answering the question, called him a young popish cur, and asked him who had made Anne a saint? The boy, being in some confusion, inquired of the next he met, which was the way to Anne's Lane; but was called a prick-eared cur for his pains, and, instead of being shewn the way, was told, that she had been a saint before he was born, and would be one after he was hanged. 'Upon this,' says Sir Roger, 'I did not think fit to repeat the former question, but, going into every lane of the neighbourhood, asked what they called the name of the lane?'"—an artifice which, it seems, succeeded.

We have chosen to take this particular view of the Reformation and the influence it had on our language, because there was a greater probability of our seeing *all* that it effected in this kind, than that we should be able to obtain at all an adequate view of the good which it wrought.

The worst it did was to tread with somewhat of irreverence where the "Holiness to the Lord" was not quite effaced.

¹ *Spectator*, No. 125.

On the other hand, it is impossible to trace the limits of the good which the Reformation effected, because it is simply boundless.

It is true, indeed, that there are instances in which the immediate influence of the Reformation may be pointed out; as, for example, the following. The Romanists had misused the word 'religion'.¹ In their hands it had come to signify an order of monkery, and a religious person was a member of a monkish order, the term meaning nothing else. The Reformation restored 'religion' to its name and dignity, rescuing it from the tender mercies of the monks.

But how many soever of such instances we might accumulate, we should not learn from them all that the Reformation has effected. Those who suppose the Reformation to have been a mere correction of abuses, greatly underrate its importance. It did more than correct; it restored. The priceless treasures which had been carefully shut out, as if the only use of the keys of St Peter is to lock that no man may open, these were brought out, and placed without reserve or hesitation in the hands of all that would. The truths, the promises, the obligations of Christianity, were set forth as they had been set forth at the first.

Indeed, while on the one hand it is a mighty task to follow out, in all its workings, the influence of the Reformation on our language, on the other hand its effects are patent, and everywhere discernible—"monumentum quæris? circumspecte."

¹ Trench, *On the Study of Words*.

CHAPTER VII.

THE DECAY OF SUPERSTITION.

WITH the generality of mankind, the place of religion is supplied, in its absence, by superstition. When those faculties of the soul, which are only capable of spiritual employment, are left to stand idle, they make work for themselves.

Their usual agent is fancy (more properly phant'sy, the German phantasie), which coins for them out of nothing what is nothing when it is made, and amuses them with dreamy exhalations, and phantoms having all the fresh appearance of life, with none of its realities.

The disappearance of such fanciful phantoms from the mind must be considered as an evidence of the approach of religion, or such radical infidelity as has never yet effected any considerable body of persons for any lengthened period, and in the same country.

Now it will not be denied that our ancestors were superstitious; or, if it be, it will not be difficult to shew that they were so.

This may be easily seen from their belief in *astrology*. The success of a person, good or ill, nay, his very disposition and turn of mind, were supposed, by our imaginative forefathers, to depend upon the particular star which had presided at his birth. Thus, if a person fell into misfortune, he might thank his stars for it—it was a *disaster*: if he was generally given to be unfortunate, the cause did not lie at his own door—he was *ill-starred*. This being so, we may easily imagine that our forefathers would hold it to be highly imprudent

to set about anything without having first consulted the stars, without having first *con-sidered* it¹.

Then, too, the disposition of persons was supposed to depend on the particular planet under which they were born. Those who had Jupiter for their birth-star were *jovial*, and none beside; none could be called *mercurial*, save those who were born under Mercury; none *saturnine*, on whose nativity Saturn had not shined.

The *words*, it is true, remain witnesses of what was once believed; but their primary signification is lost, simply because the belief which had originated them is no more.

Again, in the early ages men stood in profound awe of the supposed powers of witchcraft.

As every one was supposed to be under the influence of a particular star, so nobody was thought to be without an attendant spirit². This spirit was called his *genius*. Hence, if a person displayed talents of any kind, this was said to be owing to his *genius*.

If those talents were shining, they were attributed to his good genius, *sein genie* (German), if extraordinary, to a great genius. And, generally, clever men were so, because they were *in-genious*.

But the air was not supposed to be peopled with good genii only. There were evil *genii*. To these might be traced all the wickedness that was done on the earth. Whatsoever was done amiss, they were the doers of it. Their 'modus operandi' differed somewhat from that of the good genii. They not only worked on men's minds themselves, but employed human agents for that purpose.

Thus, every *wicked* person was so because he was

¹ 'Consider' and 'contemplate' are derived from the practice of the Roman augurs.

² A belief derived from the Romans.

bewitched; wicked meaning nothing else in its primary signification than witched, or be-witched. And the *guilt* that was in him was the effect of his having been *beguiled*, for guilt is only guil't, guiled, or, as we should say, beguiled. The corresponding substantive is 'guile,' which is the same as our 'wile.'

In French it is 'guille.' Menage says, "Guille, c'est un vieux mot françois, qui signifie tromperie." It comes (viz. guile or wile) from an Anglo-Saxon word meaning to divine, conjure.

Thus sin was supposed to be the effect of witchcraft. No marvel then if witches were looked upon with a kind of horror, as it is evident they were from the only remaining signification of the word *grim*¹, which once meant witch.

From this superstitious anxiety have arisen many words, which were originally given as names to these genii—Urchin, Puck (Pug, the Welsh Bug), droll, wight, goblin, dwarf, lubber, nightmare, bugbear, and others.

To the same belief, if belief it may be called, we owe the word *changeling*. The origin of this word is rather curious.

The fairies were supposed to steal the most beautiful and witty children, and leave in their place such as were ugly and stupid. These were usually called changelings. This meaning is illustrated by the following passage:—

"From thence a faery thee unweeting reft,
There as thou slepst in tender swaddling band;
And her base elfin brood then for thee left."

Faerie Queene.

A *charmer*, in the days when the genii bare rule, had a more extended influence than over mere flesh and blood.

Those "of old time" believed too that "chance, high

¹ Dr Guest, *On the Early-English Settlements*. He observes that *grim* is the same as the Scotch *grame*.

arbiter, ruled all." Hence, those were pronounced fortunate who were 'happy,' *i.e.* whose 'hap' was in their favour.

All these superstitions have been ; but they are not now. At the present day 'necromancer' is almost less known than 'body-snatcher.'

The Germans have a word by which they designate an incredible tale—'märchen,' which is probably from the same root as 'nightmare.' When a man is told that the story he has been narrating is a 'märchen,' he receives a compliment of about the same value as 'Credat Judæus.' He is told that what he has been saying is as credible as a ghost-story.

The fact is, a new generation has sprung up, which knows not the genii. The words which a belief in them gave rise to, still exist, but their primary significations have to be sought out in the writings of a bygone age, for they are now no more. And this fact, by itself, is an evidence of the influence of Christianity properly so called, as certainly as the gradually retreating darkness is the best possible proof that the day is dawning. When Christianity (for no other religion is free from superstition, and therefore the approaching religion must, in this case, have been Christianity) began to make itself felt, when it engaged the attention, and engrossed the thoughts of those who embraced it, when it employed the soul, then whatever else of a spiritual, or rather pseudo-spiritual character, may have occupied it, was of necessity neglected and forgotten.

Or, if they were had in remembrance at all, it was only to be set up like so many 'Εμψύσαι in nurseries, to be dreaded by children, have jests made upon them by the thoughtless, and awaken thankfulness in the grave, that they were not born in an age when superstition was held to be religion, and religion superstition.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE BIBLE AND ITS PHRASEOLOGY.

THERE is something so cogent in the arguments brought forward by Addison, in the following passage from the *Spectator*, and they appear to corroborate so fully our own opinion, which it might have appeared presumptuous to have stated so strongly without some authority, that it seems good to set down the whole passage at length.

“There is a certain coldness and indifference in the phrases of the European languages, when they are compared with the oriental forms of speech; and it happens very luckily that the Hebrew idioms run into the English tongue with a particular grace and beauty. Our language has received innumerable elegancies and improvements from that infusion of Hebraisms, which are derived to it out of the poetical passages in Holy Writ. They give a force and energy to our expressions, warm and animate our language, and convey our thoughts in more ardent and intense phrases than any that are to be met with in our own tongue. There is something so pathetic in this kind of diction, that it often sets the mind in a flame, and makes our hearts burn within us. How cold and dead does a prayer appear, that is composed in the most polite and elegant forms of speech, which are natural to our tongue, when it is not heightened by that solemnity of phrase, which may be drawn from the sacred writings. It has been said by some of the ancients, that if the gods were to talk with men, they would certainly speak in Plato’s style; but I think we may say with justice,

that when mortals converse with their Maker, they cannot do it in so proper a style as in that of the Holy Scriptures.

"If any would judge of the beauties of poetry that are to be met with in the divine writings, and examine how kindly the Hebrew manners and forms of speech mix and incorporate with the English language, after having perused the Book of Psalms, let him read a literal translation of Horace or Pindar.

"He will find in these two last such an absurdity and confusion of style, with such a comparative poverty of imagination, as will make him very sensible of what I have been here advancing."—*Spectator*, No. 405.

Addison's own version of the xxiii^d Psalm¹ might be given as an illustration of what he has here alluded to.

To take two words which occur in that Psalm, 'shepherd' and 'cup,' how excellent are the various meanings which have been derived to us from the different senses in which they have been employed in Scripture! The pastoral nature of the duty of Christ's ministers, who are to be like their Chief Shepherd in this respect, feeding the flock of Christ, the similitude of all followers of Christ to sheep, who sometimes err and stray like lost sheep, sometimes follow their Shepherd, because they know His voice, and know not the voice of strangers—these, from Biblical phrases, have become expressions of our own. Again, the cup of blessing which we bless, the cup of sorrow, the cup of salvation, and other similar phrases, are grown familiar to us, in other words, have been incorporated into our language. Many more instances of a like nature might be brought forward, "the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written."

¹ "The Lord my pasture shall prepare," &c.

Such are *seed*, from the sense in which it is used in "the good seed are the children of the kingdom;" so *root*, *branch*, *fruit*, *bread*, in the sense of 'bread of life,' *snare*, (of the devil), *vineyard*, *forbidden fruit*, *member*, in the sense of "member of Christ," and many more.

We shall not speak further on the *general* influence of Scripture phraseology on our language.

There are, however, some *particular* instances, which appear to claim notice.

Among these, may be noticed the adjectives in use with us to denote a whole or sick state of health in the body, *well*, *ill*; of which the German 'wohl,' 'unwohl,' are translations. The French have 'malade,' 'maladie.'

The origin of this practice of attaching the epithet of well or ill, to a sound or unsound state of health, appears to be a Scriptural one.

It was with the conviction that *sin is the remote* cause of disease (perhaps even the immediate cause, as was commonly believed among the Jews) that the disciples said, "Master, who *did sin*, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?"—John ix. 2. Thus sickness was looked upon as a punishment from God for sin. There is a recognition of this belief in our two words 'plague' (πληγή) and 'pain' (*poena*), the one word owning the penalty, and the other not denying that "it is the finger of God" which inflicts that penalty.

Another phrase, which owes its origin to Scripture, is '*out-herod Herod*.' Although not much is related of Herod the Great in Holy Writ, still the little that we find there is quite sufficient to shew how he earned for himself his reputation for cruelty. And so, to outdo

¹ A contraction for *evil*.

² Herod was a prominent character in the ranting plays which grew out of the mysteries. See commentaries on Shakspeare.

such monstrosity grew into a proverb. Shakspeare seems to have been haunted by the very of idea him :

“What a Herod of Jewry is this.”

Merry Wives of Windsor.

“It out-herods Herod ; pray you avoid it.”

Hamlet.

The two words, ‘pharisaical’ and ‘hypocrite,’ owe their present meanings to the unsparing rebuke of the Pharisees by our Lord. Ὑποκριτής is, properly speaking, nothing more than a stage-actor, one who sustains a part in a dialogue.

Other Scripture words are *alms*, from the Greek ; the German is ‘almosen,’ which shews its derivation more clearly ; *man of talents* (from the parable of the talents) ; *lazar* house, (*lazzaretto*, &c.), from Lazarus ; *first-born of Egypt*, to designate the high-born :

“I’ll go sleep if I can ; if I cannot, I’ll rail against all the first-born of Egypt.”—SHAKSPEARE.

As for ‘maudlin,’ many, and among them Mr Trench, look upon it as a Scripture word, deriving it from Magdalene¹. If we might hazard a conjecture, we would derive it from *magd*, the German, and ‘maid,’ the English word for a girl ; in which case ‘maudlin’ would be, what in fact it is, not far removed from *girlish*.

Mr Trench has mentioned some proverbs of great beauty which he very justly traces to Scriptural sources. Thus, from “not one of them (sparrows) is forgotten before God,” (Luke xii. 6) he derives the Catalan proverb,

“No se mou le fulla, que Deu no ha vulla².”

And from “no man can serve two masters” (Matt. vi. 34) he derives the Spanish :

¹ The reason is that the pictures of Mary Magdalene were painted with weeping eyes, and thus resembled those of a person weeping or drunk.—(RICHARDSON). Sir T. More wrote it *maudleyne*.

² “No leaf moves, but God wills it.”

“ Qui eva dos Senores ha de servir
Al uno ha de mentir¹.”

And we may add to these our own homely proverb, “the devil’s corn goes all to bran;” which takes its rise from the “mammon of unrighteousness.”

Christ’s miracle of the loaves and fishes, followed as it was by His admonitory rebuke, “labour not for the meat which perisheth,” has given rise to our proverb of the loaves and fishes.

To St Paul we owe the proverb he quoted, “Evil communications corrupt good manners;” and to Simon Magus must be traced ‘simony.’

We have purposely chosen a variety of examples, in order to shew that the influence of biblical phraseology has made itself felt throughout society, and pervaded every grade; not only affecting the parlance of a single class of society, but appearing in the expressions of high and low, simple and learned; nay, that even uncircumcised lips may be found unconsciously giving utterance to hallowed words.

¹ ‘He who has to serve two masters has to lie to one.’

CONCLUSION.

A MORE lengthened inquiry might have furnished us with many more proofs, than those already given, of the truth of the statement made at the outset, viz. that the tone of a nation's religion at any given period of its history may be learned from the state of its language at that period.

For every greater or less variation in the religious sentiments of a people we might have sought, and should find, if we were to seek aright, a corresponding variation in its language.

And by ascertaining the difference between the conditions of the various languages of Europe at any given time, we might have learnt the different intensities of the influence with which Christianity inspired the various nations of Europe at that time. In this way we might have built up a complete history of the variations of the Christian religion in the different countries of Europe, "from the first day until now."

Thus, for example, by tracing the history of the word *pilgrim*¹ (*peregrinus*) from its rise to its decay, we might learn the nature and extent of the influence, which the practice of travelling with a combined view to information and devotion wrought on society while it lasted.

Mr Trench has given an example of the way in which this might be done, which has just been alluded to, viz. comparing the state of religion in different countries, by comparing the different forms which a particular proverb has assumed in those countries.

¹ Coming, as it does, from *peregrinus*, as may be seen from the Italian forms of the word *pellegrino*, *peregrino*.

The proverb which he gives is this,

English, "The river past, and God forgotten."

Spanish, "The river past, and the *saint* forgotten."

Italian, "The river past, and the *saint* mocked."

The existence of the same proverb in these three countries, in these three forms, is a lively illustration of the different national feelings which have so preserved it.

But such an investigation as that alluded to, must be the work not only of months, but of years. And so it was felt from the first, that, however, interesting it may be, it must at best be a future one.

All that was aimed at was a *general view* of the subject. But, if we were compelled by the *exigency* of the case to leave much undone, the inquiry could not be completed by reason also of the *nature* of the case. For, if the nature of the subject required us in some measure, 'ruere in medias res' at the outset, we are also, to a certain extent, compelled to make an ending while still 'in mediis rebus.' For Christianity did not begin to influence the languages of modern Europe, till after its establishment elsewhere, and subsequently to its having influenced other languages.

Again, the influence of Christianity upon the language of Modern Europe is not yet completed. Much yet remains to be changed. It will not be till "the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea," that the consummation will be arrived at, which was contemplated by "holy men of old," who "saw it afar off;" when "all shall mind the same thing," and, as a natural consequence, all shall speak the same thing,—when all people and nations shall become one people and one nation, and therefore all languages shall be one language; when the curse of Babel shall be removed, and the whole earth shall be of one speech, as it had been at the first.

When **THE WORD** was made flesh, He only *tabernacled* among us ; nor did He come to reign. He took on Himself the form of a servant, though He was Lord of all. But, when He comes again the second time in glory, from that place whither He has gone to receive for Himself a kingdom and to return, then will He take the heathen for His inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession.

And then, but not till then, shall one universal anthem of praise arise from a ransomed world, when every tongue shall confess that **THE WORD** is all in all, to the glory of God the Father.

APPENDIX I. (to Chapter V.)

INCIDENTAL evidence is afforded by the English and German languages of the difference which exists between the two nations (so far as the Lutherans are concerned) in their belief concerning the elements of the Lord's Supper.

For our English term for the symbol of Christ's body is merely *bread*. In the days of our belief in the mystical transformation of that element, we had, besides 'host' (or 'victim'), the word *wafer* as a general term whereby to designate the bread. Now wafer is several times used in Holy Writ¹ to mean an offering of flour: it is from the verb to 'waive.'

The Germans still retain the word which had been in use among them in the Romish times for the bread, viz. *oblat*, the identical *oblatio*.

Now this is in precise accordance with the historical fact. For we have rejected the doctrine of consubstantiation, while the Lutherans retain it.

The cup is called *chalice* among ourselves, and *kelch* among the Germans; there being no difference of opinion in this matter, both have retained what they had before the Reformation.

It may be observed that the term *gossip*² was framed by our ancestors to express the relationship which those took upon themselves who became sponsors at baptism. For it is from *God*, and *sib*, or *syb*, a relation. In old times there was a statute by virtue of which persons in 'gossipred,' i. e. standing in this relation, might be

¹ See Exod. xxix. 2 and 23; Num. vi. 19.

² See Humphry, *On the Book of Common Prayer*.

challenged as jurymen, they being looked upon as not wholly unprejudiced persons.

How has not *Sacramentum* been ennobled ! Among the Romans it had two meanings. One was, the *military oath*, which a soldier had to swear “*se obtemperatum imperatoribus juxta vires*,” while there was no covenant made by the general with the soldier. The other meaning was, the deposits paid by contending litigants into the treasury of some temple, to be forfeited to its sacred uses in case of loss of suit.

Anciently the Lord's Supper had been called *κυριακόν*. St Paul called it so. And it is probably from this circumstance that *κυριακή* came to mean what it does, having been applied from the Communion to those who communicated.

APPENDIX II.

WE subjoin a few words from among a number of synonyms collected in the course of reading, to make it appear that our language has been enriched by some Hebrew words. Nor are we desirous of hanging an argument thereon, thinking it of sufficient interest in itself, even on the supposition that all have been derived from sources independent of Christianity.

If, however, they will appear to prove anything, *valeant quantum valent.*

יֵשׁ, yes.

מִטֶּה, mite, French mite.

הֶבֶנִי, ebony, ἔβενος, ebenum, 'eben-holz.' French ébène.

גֶרֶן, grain, French grain, Germ. gran, Latin granum.

גָמֵל, camel, Germ. kameel, Ital. camello.

יֹבֵל, Jubilee, Ital. giubbileo.

לָחַץ, to lick: Germ. lecken, Ital. leccare; λείχω.

עָבַר, over, Germ. über.

דֹּם, dumb.

עוֹיֵל, evil, übel.

מִסַּךְ, to mix, misceo.

תּוּר, hence tour, Dutch toer, French tour.

אֲתִיק, a gallery, our attic.

נָפַל, to fall.

עֶרֶב, corvus, a crow, German 'rabe.'

שַׁק, sack, Germ. sack ; saccus, σάκκος.

לִיז, lose.

לֶהֱט, kindle, *light*.

כְּרוּב, cherub, Germ. cherub.

דָּוַר, Germ. dauern ; compare 'endure,' 'durus,'
 δηρός.

אב, Syr. abba, whence abbot, abbey.

&c., &c.

CAMBRIDGE:
PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.
